DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 296 630 HE 021 494

AUTHOR Trent, William T.; Copeland, Elaine J.
TITLE Effectiveness of State Financial Aid in the Production of Black Doctoral Recipients. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Southern Education Foundation, Atlanta, Ga.
PUB DATE 87
NOTE 211p.
AVAILABLE FROM Southern Education Foundation, 340 West Peachtree Street, Suite 250, Atlanta, GA 30308 ($5.00 plus postage).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC09 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Access to Education; *Black Students; College Admission; College Graduates; *Doctoral Degrees; *Graduate Study; Higher Education; Questionnaires; *State Aid; *Student Financial Aid; Student Recruitment
IDENTIFIERS Florida; Georgia; Oklahoma; Virginia

ABSTRACT

The efforts of Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Oklahoma, and Virginia to increase the production of black recipients of the doctoral degree were studied. These five states have traditionally operated racially dual structures of postsecondary education. Secondary analyses of national and state data are provided, along with results of interviews with key informants in the states and the doctorate granting universities. Results show that little change in the number of doctorates granted to blacks has occurred between 1975-1976 and 1983-1984 despite the presence of state provided funds for doctoral study. First-time graduate enrollments have decreased slightly and there have been no substantial gains in black/white parity at the graduate level and considerable fluctuation from year to year. It is suggested that new funding arrangements implemented in each state have served mainly to improve the quality of graduate and doctoral level support for the same numbers rather than to increase the size of the candidate pool. Admissions and recruitment approaches and state and college administrative efforts vary widely but share some common features. Exemplary practices are identified and policy recommendations are offered. Appendices include the interview schedule and information on state plans to serve black students. Contains 24 references. (Author/SW)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED296630

# Effectiveness of State Financial Aid in the Production of Black Doctoral Recipients

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Karima Al-Amin

Southern Education Foundation

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

HE 021 494

Southern Education Foundation
Atlanta, Georgia 30308

# Effectiveness of State Financial Aid in the Production of Black Doctoral Recipients

William T. Trent

and

Elaine J. Copeland

University of Illinois
at Urbana-Champaign

Final Report of Research
Completed for the
Southern Education Foundation, Inc.

Copyright © 1987 by the Southern Education Foundation, Atlanta, Georgia. All rights reserved. Printed in the USA.

This document is being published and distributed by the Southern Education Foundation. The interpretations and conclusions contained in this publication represent the views of the authors and not necessarily those of the Foundation.

## FOREWORD

The Southern Education Foundation and the family philanthropies which preceded it have had a special and continuing interest in the education of Black Americans for more than a hundred years. The Foundation has been concerned particularly with programs aimed at increasing and improving higher education opportunities primarily for blacks in the South.

In April, 1974, the Board of Directors (renamed Board of Trustees in 1984) established a special project, the Higher Education Program, to address issues which were surfacing as a result of the then Adams v. Richardson case. Under this higher education component, the Foundation supported coalitions formed by citizens to monitor state desegregation plans, sponsored conferences and workshops, published papers, monographs and documents, and awarded general grants which focused specifically on achieving equity in higher education in the ten states originally affected by the Adams case.

In September, 1978, the Higher Education Program proposed concentrating a major portion of its allocation on a Research Task Force which was formed to plan a research agenda for the Foundation and to commission research projects. This body of six educators has commissioned over 25 studies since its inception; this document is presented as part of the Higher Education Program Research Series. Other publications which are part of the series are listed at the end of this report and are available to the public at a cost of $5.00 each.

SEF was able to expand its Higher Education Program as a result of receiving grants from 1983 to 1986 from the Ford Foundation; the publication of this report is made possible by the grants.

A list of other Foundation publications may be obtained by writing to the Southern Education Foundation.

Thank you.

Elridge W. McMillan, President

April, 1987

SOUTHERN EDUCATION FOUNDATION
340 West Peachtree Street, N.W.
Suite 250
Atlanta, Georgia 30308
(404) 523-0001

Price: $5.00

## Table of Contents


| | Page |
|---|---|
| Chapter 1 | |
| Introduction | 1 |
| A Chronology of the Adams Case | 1 |
| The Status of Black Americans in Graduate Education | 4 |
| Purpose of the Study and its Limitations | 8 |
| Chapter 2 | |
| Research Design and Methodology | 11 |
| The Data | 13 |
| State Reports | 13 |
| Chapter 3 | |
| The Responses of Arkansas, Georgia, Oklahoma, and Virginia to Adams | 17 |
| An Overview of Enrollment and Doctoral Degree Attainment in the Selected States | 18 |
| Reports From the Individual States | |
| Arkansas | 25 |
| Florida | 33 |
| Georgia | 47 |
| Oklahoma | 58 |
| Virginia | 71 |
| Summary | 77 |
| Chapter 4 | |
| Results | 79 |
| Summary | 90 |
| Chapter 5 | |
| Recommendations | 93 |
| Financial Aid | 93 |
| Recruitment and Retention | 96 |
| Support Services | 98 |
| Administration | 99 |
| Conclusion | 103 |
| References | 104 |
| Appendices | |
| A. Interview Schedule | 107 |
| B. Names of Key Informants | 119 |
| C. State Plan Commitments to Increase Black Graduate Enrollment in the Five Adams States | 123 |
| D. Degree Attainment by Race/Ethnicity in Traditionally Black and White Universities | 144 |
| E. The Adams Case: An Annotated Chronology | 165 |
| About the Authors | 170 |

## List of Tables & Charts


| Table | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Graduate Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity in Traditionally Black and White Public Colleges, 1976-1982. . . . . | 19 |
| 2 | Percentage Distributions of Earned Doctorates by Race/Ethnicity in Traditionally Black and White Public College 1975-76 to 1980-81. . . . . | 21 |
| 3 | Black Ph.D. Degree Attainment for Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Oklahoma, and Virginia . . . . . | 81 |
| 4 | First-Time Graduate Enrollment for Black Students in Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Oklahoma, and Virginia . . . . . | 83 |
| 5 | Characteristics of State, Systemwide Financial Aid for Black Doctoral/Graduate Students in Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Oklahoma and Virginia . . . . . | 86 |
| 6 | Black Full-Time Graduate Enrollment: Even years, 1972 to 1984 | 92 |
| G-1 | Regents' Opportunity Grants Awards Made for DOCTORAL Level Programs (Professional Programs Excluded) 1978 - 1984 . . . | 51 |
| F-1 | Summary of EEO Allocations by Action Force 1974-75 to 1984-85 . . . . . | 38,39 |
| F-2 | Student Grant-in-Aid Program Participants as Percent of Black Graduate Student Enrollment in Graduate and Professional Programs, 1981-82 . . . . . | 41 |
| F-3 | Student Grant-in-Aid Program Participants as Percent of Black Graduate Student Enrollment in graduate and Professional Programs, 1982-83 . . . . . | 42 |
| OK-1 | Projected First-Year Resident Graduate Enrollment by Black/White Ratio and Area of Study . . . . . | 61 |
| OK-2 | Revised Incremental Goals to Increase Degrees Granted by Four-Year and Graduate Institutions Expressed as Black/White Ratios . . . . . | 62 |
| OK-3 | Seven Years of Black Enrollments by Academic Class Level for the State System . . . . . | 63 |
| OK-4 | A Five-Year Comparison of the Black to White Ratio of Bachelor's and Graduate Degree Recipients in the State System . . . . . | 64 |

## List of Charts


| Charts | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Earned Doctorates by Race in Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Virginia and the Nation: 1975-76 - 1980-81. . . . . | 22 |
| 2 | Earned Bachelor's Degrees by Race in Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Virginia and the Nation 1975-76 - 1980-81. . . . . | 23 |

## ABSTRACT

This research examines the efforts of five states centering on increasing the production of black recipients of the doctoral degree. The five states (Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Oklahoma, and Virginia) are each states that have traditionally operated racially dual structures of postsecondary education and who, as a result of Adams vs. Richardson (1972), have been required not only to dismantle the dual structure but also to provide specific procedures to remedy past desegregation effects including an increase in black graduate level enrollment and degree attainment.

We report results from secondary analyses of national and state data as well as results from interviews with key informants in each of the five states and their respective doctorate granting universities. Our results show that little change in the number of doctorates granted to blacks has occurred between 1975-76 and 1983-84 despite the presence of state provided funds for doctoral study. First-time graduate enrollments have decreased slightly and there has been no substantial gains in black/white parity at the graduate level and considerable fluctuation from year to year.

These results suggest that new funding arrangements implemented in each state have mainly served to improve the quality of graduate and doctoral level support for the same numbers rather than to increase the size of the candidate pool. Moreover, admission procedures, recruitment strategies, and the administration of the states' and individual universities' efforts vary widely but share some common features.

Exemplary practices are identified and policy recommendations are offered where appropriate.

# Chapter 1

## Introduction

Central to the assessment of the access of black Americans to doctoral programs and completion of those programs is the quality of financial support available. Yet little information is available to indicate the level and quality of support black doctoral students receive from individual states. While the federal government has made some commitment to increasing access by supporting minority graduate students, the Graduate and Professional Opportunity Program (G-POP), recently renamed the Patricia Roberts Harris Program, is the single federal program designed to increase the number of minority doctoral recipients in areas where they are grossly underrepresented. Astin (1982) maintains that individual states are viewed as being primarily responsible for increasing student access at all levels of the educational system. Yet funding from states that have targeted minority students has mainly been used to support low income "undergraduate" student populations. The landmark Adams Case has substantially influenced the role of the states in providing financial aid to black students, since those states cited as having supported dual systems of higher education are legally required to provide equal educational opportunity for their residents.

## A Chronology of the Adams Case

Haynes (1978) opens his presentation of the Adams chronology as follows:

> "The most important legal action to affect the educational hopes and aspirations of blacks in colleges since 1954 involves decisions growing out of the Adams case. The case is important to the interests of blacks because it seeks to (1) identify an acceptable plan to implement public higher

> education and (2) formulate policies to insure access and increase participation rates for black Americans at all levels of society."

Formally known as Adams vs. Richardson, the suit was filed on behalf of students attending public schools and colleges that continued to be in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution and in violation of Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act which stated that schools found to segregate and discriminate on the basis of race could not receive federal financial assistance. Also included as plaintiffs were those citizens and taxpayers whose taxes were being used to support public schools and colleges that operated in violation of Title VI. Then Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, Elliot T. Richardson along with the director of the Office for Civil Rights, Stanley Pottinger, were named as defendants and Kenneth R. Adams, a student, was the first of the listed plaintiffs (Haynes, 1978). Appendix E (Haynes, 1978) provides a comprehensive chronology of the Adams Case. For our purposes, the publication of the Amended criteria (August 1977) specifying the requirements with which HEW expected the states to comply is a crucial event since it provides the guidelines by which the states included in this report are judged.

HEW initially sent letters to officials of the states of Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, and Virginia. Each state was to submit a detailed plan on how it would desegregate its dual system of higher education. By January of 1970 none of the ten states had submitted acceptable plans. In October of 1970 the Legal Defense Fund (LDF) filed a class action suit. In February of 1973 the court

ordered HEW to obtain compliance plans from the ten states or to enforce Title VI by terminating federal funds to those states not providing acceptable plans. By June of 1974 nine of the ten states had submitted plans. The original plans were not acceptable and states were asked to submit revised plans. In 1978 six Adams states (Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, Oklahoma, and Virginia) submitted statewide plans based on the Amended criteria published in the Federal Register, August 11, 1977. HEW accepted the plans of Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Oklahoma, and Virginia. North Carolina's plan was not accepted (Haynes, 1978). The Amended Criteria submitted by HEW provided a five part section entitled Elements of a Plan. Those five broad parts are:

I. Disestablishment of the Structure of the Dual System

II. Desegregation of Student Enrollment

III. Desegregation of Faculty, Administrative Staffs, Non-Academic Personnel and Governing Boards

IV. Submission of Plans and Monitoring

V. Definitions

Each of the four substantive parts contains subsections detailing the obligations of the states in order to be in compliance. Part II, paragraphs C and E provide the criteria for which the states included in this report are being evaluated. These criteria require (1) that equal proportions of resident black and white in-state baccalaureate recipients enroll in in-state graduate programs and (2) that the state reduce any disparity in the proportions of blacks and whites successfully completing and graduating at all degree levels (See Appendix C for criteria II C and E).

In continuing adherence to part IV of the Amended criteria, in January 1983, USOCR delivered letters of evaluation to each of the first-tier states. Those letters requested extensions of the plans through 1985-86 and also requested amendments in the existing plans.

An assessment of the relationship of the availability and quality of state financial support for black doctoral students and the level of black Ph.D. production of each state is facilitated by an examination of progress toward compliance on the part of the Adams states with accepted plans as of 1978. Since these states were required to submit plans early and because the plans of each of these states include procedures to increase access of black students to doctoral programs, they provide an important source of data on efforts and accomplishments in increasing the number of black Ph.D.'s.

## The Status of Black Americans in Graduate Education

A number of researchers have examined the status of black Americans in higher education (Astin, 1982; Brown and Stent, 1977; Blackwell, 1975, 1981; Copeland, 1984; Morris, 1979; Preer, 1982; Thomas, 1981; Trent, 1984 a,b). Each of these authors discusses those factors that impede or promote access, persistence and success.

Several factors have been cited as major barriers to equal educational opportunity at both the undergraduate and graduate level: prior preparation, restrictive admission policies, low test performance, poor information/guidance and inadequate financial support (Copeland, 1984). Thomas (1981) reported that while the quality of financial aid is an important factor in increasing the access of black Americans to all levels of higher education, family

background, income, and the lack of financial aid are major impediments to black students seeking advanced graduate and professional degrees. This is due, in part, to the fact that both federal and state governments have historically provided less support for graduate than for undergraduate minority and low income students. Studies conducted by Howard University researchers (Institute for the Study of Educational Policy, 1979, 1981) indicate, however, that the negative effects of family income were much greater at the graduate and professional school levels (1979). While the financial needs of black graduate students are greater than those for their white counterparts, a report from the National Advisory Committee on Black Higher Education 1980, the National Research Council Summary Report of Doctoral Recipients from United States Universities 1982 revealed that black students were less likely than white doctoral recipients to have been supported with teaching and research assistantships and that black students have tended to rely on different sources of aid to support their graduate education compared to their white counterparts (Bruce, 1973; Morris, 1979).

In a recent study, Blackwell (1982) examined the status of black Americans in selected graduate and professional fields. His study consisted of two phases, the first an analysis of survey data received from certain institutions offering advanced training for eight professional fields. The second phase involved a trend analysis of first year enrollment and graduation rates of black students for these professional schools during the 1970s. The Blackwell study examined both access and retention. He assessed the extent to which such factors as recruiting, presence and quality of

retention programs, presence and quality of financial support and the presence of special admission programs, influenced the enrollment and retention of black students in eight graduate and professional programs. In addition to documenting the underrepresentation of blacks in the professions, Blackwell's research underscores the crucial role and importance of financial support.

The American Council on Education, citing the concentration of doctoral degrees earned by blacks, reported 60% of the 1980-81 doctorates being awarded by 10% of doctoral granting institutions including Howard University, a traditionally black institution. In accounting for this institutional concentration, they cite a lack of recruitment, limited financial assistance, and restrictive admissions policies. Both the Blackwell and Peterson et al. (1978) studies show that demonstrated commitment on the part of colleges and universities in the form of special support efforts, vigorous recruitment and ample financial assistance can yield important improvements in enrollment, retention and graduation for blacks at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.

The severity of the underrepresentation of blacks at the Ph.D. level has also been addressed in recent research. Trent (1984b), using data from the Higher Education General Information Survey, reports a modest gain in earned doctorates by blacks nationally from 1975-76 to 1980-81 (from 1,169 to 1,265 or 3.4% to 3.7%) while overall there was a net decline for total number of earned doctorates for the same period. Even with that modest gain, however, blacks lost ground with respect to parity. In 1970 blacks were 5.2% of the availability pool--persons 20 to 34 years old with at least four

years of college--and by 1976 they were 5.7% of that pool. Thus the +.3% gain in their share of all earned doctorates was outdistanced by their +.5% gain as a portion of the availability pool. That research further showed the concentration of Ph.D. degrees by major field, especially for blacks, where about half of all black Ph.D.'s are earned in education.

A further indication of the severity of the problem is given by the American Council on Education (1984). In their examination of academically employed minorities with a Ph.D., they report that in 1979 about three percent of academic positions were held by native born minorities or about 5,500 out of approximately 170,000. Native-born blacks held about 2,150 of these positions.

The production of black doctorates thus continues to be a challenge of major proportions in terms of access, persistence and graduation. Each of the previously cited studies reports financial aid as a major factor in increasing or impeding access and retention. There is little available research, however, that has systematically examined the relationship of the availability of financial aid to black Ph.D. aspirants specifically. Since the Adams states examined here have had experience in developing statewide plans to rectify the past inequities of racially dual systems, an examination of these five states' financial aid efforts at the doctoral level should allow for a more informative analysis.

## Purpose of the Study and its Limitations

The purpose of this study is to examine the effectiveness of state financial aid in the production of black doctorate recipients in five states: Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Oklahoma and Virginia. In doing so we seek to identify the outcomes of these states reponses to Adams and to shed light on those factors contributing to observed outcomes. We however acknowledge the limitations of this research due to between state differences in postsecondary organizational and administrative structures, institutional governance differences and the nature of the data employed in this research. These limitations are discussed below.

Because the structure of governance varied considerably among states, descriptions of programs are not always comparable. For example in Arkansas, Georgia and Oklahoma, programs are being implemented at the state level. In Virginia each institution is governed by its Board of Visitors with more recent central coordinated efforts being evident. In Georgia, Virginia, Oklahoma and Florida unique institutional programs are also in place. The level of activity varies depending on the individual institution. Our first limitation is to note that some comparisons between states are likely to be misleading and are not encouraged.

Identifying and selecting the persons to be interviewed was influenced by administrative and organizational structures both at the system and institutional levels. For example, at the institutional level Georgia State University has no graduate dean, while at both The University of Georgia and Georgia Institute of

Technology, the graduate dean is responsible for administering graduate programs including responsibility for the graduate programs created in response to Georgia's Adams Plan. The person responsible for coordinating campus activities and programs as well as the level of administrative support available also varied from one institution to another. At the University of Arkansas, the person responsible for coordinating efforts was the Director of Human Relations, while at Georgia Institute of Technology programs were administered in the graduate school but there was no single individual whose primary responsibility was to administer "Adams" programs. A person was so designated at The University of Florida. This diversity is reflected in the state analyses and account for some of the state to state variability found in this report. Our second limitation then is to acknowledge that it is likely to be misleading to overstate the benefits or hindrances of a particular administrative structure.

In addition to the above limitations which constrain our ability to generalize due to between-state and within-state institutional and administrative differences, there are further limitations due to some aspects of the data employed in this research. The Higher Education General Information Surveys (HEGIS) are institutional reports, not individual level data and hence not suitable for inferences about the quality or other characteristics of students beyond the institutions' reporting of their race, ethnicity, gender, enrollment status or degree status.

Numerical data collected from each state and each campus are used to supplement the HEGIS enrollment and degree attainment reports as well as to provide an informed appraisal of state and

institutional efforts. There are however, substantial variations in counting procedures and reporting processes which impair the data comparability across states and institutions. Unlike HEGIS data, these supplemental sources are not subject to standardized forms and are sometimes reported differently from year to year. We attempt to minimize this limitation by: (1) seeking clarification of changes in reported data from year-to-year; (2) using state-compiled, multiple year reports rather than year-to-year reports, and; (3) identifying obvious reporting departures where necessary.

Finally, this report examines just five of nineteen (19) states that are or have been impacted by Adams vs. Richardson. Although they are key states in several respects, we cannot argue from these data that more or less progress has been made in those states not covered by this research. We also make no claim that the five states included in this report are exemplars in any special sense and neither typical or atypical of progress in other states with a history of dual systems of higher education.

## Chapter 2

## Research Design and Methodology

The principal concerns of this research are: (1) to describe and document the level, quality, and variety of expenditures directed toward the production of doctoral degrees for blacks within selected Adams states; (2) to provide a detailed count of degree production by degree granting institution for the Adams states for the period 1975-76 to 1983-84; and (3) to provide a detailed count of enrollment by full and part-time status and post-baccalaureate degree level for each of the five Adams states for the period beginning 1976 to 1984.

This research combines a modified case approach and secondary data analysis. Interviews in the states provided a detailed description of the funding level, quality and range of activities employed in facilitating the production of black doctorates in the selected Adams states. The interviews also provide some elaboration of uniquely promising or successful practices and a composite description of progress toward the production of black doctorates. Secondary analysis of national institutional data and state reports identifies trends in black graduate enrollment and doctoral degree attainment for each state.

First, those data that are publicly available and offer counts by race and sex for each higher education institution for conferred degrees and enrollment status and level, provided an invaluable and immediately available source of trend data for each of the Adams states. The Higher Education General Information Survey (HEGIS) of Fall Enrollment and Earned Degrees contain data for each of the fifty states. In addition to these national data, of which the Adams

states and institutions are a subsample, there were two additional types of pre-collected data which are in the public domain but pertain only to the separate states. The five states (ARKANSAS, OKLAHOMA, FLORIDA, VIRGINIA, and GEORGIA) had completed their fifth year of reports to the U.S. Office for Civil Rights and had received evaluations indicating their progress toward compliance with the objectives detailed in their respective plans. These reports provide financial data, student counts and program implementation data that specifically address the desegregation-related activities of the states. These reports and supporting data were obtained from the U.S. Office for Civil Rights. Finally, each of the Adams states provided annual reports making available still another source of financial and student count/service data that specifically address the concerns of this research.

A second type of data employed in this assessment is that which identifies the quality, range and function of state initiated and administered programmatic efforts to recruit, admit, sustain, and graduate black doctoral degree candidates. These were obtained through interviews with state and campus level respondents (see Appendix A for the interview instrument).

The research design then was multi-stage using as a first stage, tabular descriptive analysis derived from the three sources of pre-collected data and a second stage of interviews, yielding data which facilitated an interpretive understanding of the desegregation efforts of selected Adams states at the post-baccalaureate degree level. Collectively these data provide a composite, quantitative description of the recent trends, and current level of activity for

these Adams' states, as well as an interpretive, data based narrative, which examines specific state efforts.

The Data

The pre-collected data available from the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) are of two types:

1) Opening Fall Enrollment Data: 1976 through 1982. These data cover full-time, part-time and first-time equivalent enrollment by race (biennially beginning in 1976) and sex, for undergraduate, graduate, unclassified, and first-professional degree students. It is institutional level data allowing for tabular presentation of enrollment trends for each state and for each institution within each state.

2) Earned Degrees Conferred: 1975-76 through 1980-81. These data cover bachelor's, master's, doctor's, and first-professional degrees conferred in major disciplines and sub-fields by race (first for 1975-76 and biennially through 1980-81 in major disciplines) and sex. This is institutional level data and provides actual counts for each state and for each institution within each state.

The pre-collected data from each state with accepted/operating programs are of two types:

3) State Evaluations:

a) USOCR Compliance Evaluation Letters are keyed to the specific requirements of accepted and operating plans. Letters of Evaluation were mailed to five states (OK, ARK, FLA, VA, and GA) that constitute our core Adams states selected for focused interviews. These letters of evaluation report progress toward each accepted

goal/objective and identifies new or changed levels of commitment.

b) Each state has for each of the implementation years prepared an annual report detailing:

1. the racial composition of the student body at each member campus by level and for selected academic majors
2. student retention, promotion and graduation
3. racial composition of employees
4. racial composition of non-institutional personnel, and
5. special funding for desegregation activities.

In addition to supplying valuable statistical data and a history of program evaluations, the Office for Civil Rights compliance letters provide initial assessments of the progress made by the individual states. The State's Annual Reports provide both a quantitative and a state-based qualitative assessment of progress toward Plan compliance. Moreover, these reports often reveal newly planned initiatives, institutional differences and discussions of aids and barriers to the success of Plan components.

Key informants in each of the five state system offices were identified by direct mailings to the chief system official. In addition to requesting the names, addresses and telephone numbers of system-level personnel responsible for statewide coordination of the Adams Plan, the names and addresses of campus-level personnel who were responsible for their respective campus' Adams response were also requested. The resulting list of respondents appears as Appendix B. Each informant was mailed the questionnaire and was subsequently contacted by mail and telephone to arrange an interview.

In addition to yielding the specific data requested in the interview schedule, the respondents were the primary sources of system- and campus-level annual reports described above. These key informants provided the main source of data regarding the operational character of the states' efforts, the institutional responses to state plans and a general sense of state and campus commitment to the Adams effort.

As might be expected there was considerable unevenness in the interview data due largely to differences in the state and campus level responses to Adams. Diversity in plans of action are reflected in Chapter 3 where we report the state summaries describing activities in each state. In some instances we have chosen to focus mainly on the system or statewide effort (Oklahoma and Florida) while in others we have focused on the various campus-level activities (Georgia and Virginia). In important ways, this pattern of description for the states reflects the character of administration of the Adams responses. For Arkansas where 1985-86 was the first year of implementation of graduate and doctoral level commitment as indicated by state financial support, the description of the plan provided by respondents was mainly historical and gave an overview of the general response to Adams.

Finally, it must be noted here that the key informants were extremely cooperative. While the questionnaire, except where it requested numbers and dollars, was interpreted more as a stimulus for comment than as a request for a specific response, we have not interpreted that to be an indication of reluctance to comment. Rather, we view that as (1) a weakness of the instrument itself, and

(2) as an indication of the changes over time in state and campus level personnel having responsibility for the program. In many instances informants were just too recent in their positions to be able to respond to our questions relating to the early planning phase, to implementation, to problems with initial implementation or key issues during planning and implementation. Nonetheless, these respondents provided the data requested where it was available, gave willingly of their time (interviews in person or by telephone averaged nearly ninety minutes) and expressed genuine interest in the success and the results of the research.

## Chapter 3

## The Responses of Arkansas, Georgia, Oklahoma, and Virginia to Adams

Our research design included conducting interviews in each of the five states. We identified key personnel in the state higher education agency offices and the key persons responsible for the administration and coordination of the Adams effort on each doctoral degree granting campus in each state. The co-principal investigators personally conducted face-to-face interviews in each state except Arkansas (See Appendix A for the interview schedule). Our initial contact with Arkansas informed us that their efforts to increase the production of Black doctorate recipients were still in planning. As a result we conducted our Arkansas interviews by telephone and obtained other documentary data by mail.

As stated earlier, there is noticeable unevenness in the state reports. In part, this reflects the quantity of information available from our respondents and in other ways it is a reflection of our decisions about what was useful to report. In all instances we have given primary attention to the interview data collected from state higher education agency officials. Generally we have chosen to report only those campus level activities that merit special attention and hence not every campus level interview is reported. The discussion of each state proceeds in alphabetical order beginning with Arkansas following a summary of the systemwide enrollment and earned degree data for the five states.

## An Overview of Enrollment and Degree Attainment in Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Oklahoma and Virginia

The purpose of this section is to contextualize the role played by the postsecondary public institutions in these five states based on their contributions to black enrollment and black degree attainment. Tables 1 and 2 which follow are a digest of graduate enrollment data and doctoral degree attainment data presented in tables D.1 through D.10 and tables D.11 through D.20 respectively of Appendix D for the five states included in this report.

Table 1 presents the statistics for full-time graduate enrollment by race, ethnicity, and college race for 1976, 1978, 1980, and 1982. In 1982 approximately 19,000 blacks were enrolled full-time at the graduate level nationally (see Table 6). Full-time black enrollment at the graduate level totaled 1,345 for the public colleges in these five states or about 7% of the national full-time enrollment. The corresponding figures for 1976 were 24,000 black full-time graduate students and 1783 full-time black graduate students enrolled in the public colleges in these five states, or about 8% of the national black full-time graduate enrollment. A meaningful contrast to note is that at the undergraduate level, public institutions in these states accounted for 22% and 24% of national black full-time undergraduate enrollment in 1976 and 1982 respectively. It is perhaps inappropriate to argue that the graduate enrollment percentages should correspond

**TABLE 1**

**PERCENTAGES**

Graduate Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity in Traditionally
Black and White Public Colleges
1976-1982

| Year | 1976 | | | 1978 | | | 1980 | | | 1982 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Enrollment Status<br>Race/Ethnicity<br>College Race | TBI | TWI | TOTAL | TBI | TWI | TOTAL | TBI | TWI | TOTAL | TBI | TWI | TOTAL |
| **ARKANSAS** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Full-time Graduate | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non-Resident Alien | | 6.52 | 6.52 | | 8.47 | 8.47 | | 8.33 | 8.33 | | 10.97 | 10.97 |
| 2 Black | | 6.42 | 6.42 | | 6.72 | 6.72 | | 5.57 | 5.57 | | 5.19 | 5.19 |
| 3 American Indian | | .43 | .43 | | .99 | .99 | | 1.09 | 1.09 | | .66 | .66 |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | | 1.27 | 1.24 | | .80 | .80 | | 1.26 | 1.26 | | 1.25 | 1.25 |
| 5 Hispanic | | .33 | .33 | | .71 | .71 | | 3.22 | 3.22 | | .98 | .98 |
| 6 White | | 85.06 | 85.06 | | 82.31 | 82.31 | | 83.12 | 83.12 | | 81.47 | 81.47 |
| TOTAL | | 2,102 | 2,102 | | 2,114 | 2,114 | | 2,388 | 2,388 | | 1,678 | 1,678 |
| **FLORIDA** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Full-time Graduate | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non-Resident Alien | 0 | 8.10 | 8.01 | 4.92 | 8.26 | 8.34 | | 9.91 | 9.87 | 6.82 | 14.42 | 14.34 |
| 2 Black | 73.03 | 3.71 | 4.49 | 61.92 | 4.13 | 4.70 | 67.74 | 9.46 | 4.70 | 12.73 | 3.90 | 4.71 |
| 3 American Indisn | 0 | .12 | .11 | 0 | .17 | .17 | 0 | .20 | .20 | 0 | .14 | .13 |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | 1.12 | 2.61 | .57 | 1.64 | .88 | .89 | 3.23 | 13.50 | 1.25 | 1.14 | .99 | .92 |
| 5 Hispanic | 0 | .07 | 2.58 | 0 | 3.18 | 3.16 | 3.23 | 3.57 | 3.57 | 0 | 2.77 | 2.75 |
| 6 White | 25.84 | 84.70 | 84.24 | 14.75 | 83.34 | 82.85 | 25.81 | 80.63 | 80.42 | 18.18 | 77.85 | 77.15 |
| TOTAL | 89 | 7,824 | 7,913 | 61 | 7,830 | 7,891 | 31 | 8,157 | 8,188 | 88 | 7,404 | 7,492 |
| **GEORGIA** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Full-time Graduate | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non-Resident Alien | 2.06 | 5.52 | 5.51 | 0 | 6.96 | 6.93 | 0 | 10.82 | 10.79 | 0 | 12.07 | 12.05 |
| 2 Black | 91.43 | 8.48 | 8.85 | 70.27 | 9.81 | 10.16 | 38.10 | 6.25 | 6.35 | 73.33 | 5.52 | 5.66 |
| 3 American Indian | 0 | .28 | .28 | 0 | .10 | .10 | 0 | .01 | .01 | 0 | .20 | .20 |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | 0 | .43 | .43 | 0 | .69 | .69 | 0 | .83 | .83 | 0 | 1.99 | 1.99 |
| 5 Hispanic | 0 | .32 | .32 | 0 | .45 | .45 | 0 | .65 | .65 | 0 | 1.30 | 1.29 |
| 6 White | 5.71 | 84.96 | 84.61 | 29.73 | 81.93 | 81.67 | 61.91 | 81.38 | 81.32 | 26.67 | 78.92 | 78.81 |
| TOTAL | 35 | 7,827 | 7,862 | 37 | 7,366 | 7,403 | 21 | 6,766 | 6,787 | 15 | 7,338 | 7,353 |
| **OKLAHOMA** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Full-time Graduate | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non-Resident Alien | | 19.3 | 19.3 | | 25.4 | 25.4 | | 25.4 | 25.4 | | 27.3 | 27.3 |
| 2 Black | | 3.9 | 3.9 | | 3.3 | 3.3 | | 3.6 | 3.6 | | 3.1 | 3.1 |
| 3 American Indian | | 2.3 | 2.3 | | 2.5 | 2.5 | | 2.9 | 2.9 | | 2.7 | 2.7 |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | | 1.1 | 1.1 | | .8 | .8 | | 1.8 | 1.8 | | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| 5 Hispanic | | .5 | .5 | | .7 | .7 | | 1.5 | 1.5 | | .8 | .8 |
| 6 White | | 72.8 | 72.8 | | 67.3 | 67.3 | | 64.8 | 64.8 | | 64.6 | 64.6 |
| TOTAL | | 4,457 | 4,457 | | 4,092 | 4,092 | | 4,149 | 4,149 | | 4,128 | 4,128 |
| **VIRGINIA** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Full-time Graduate | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non-Resident Alien | .9 | 4.2 | 4.1 | .8 | 5.9 | 5.6 | 7.7 | 7.9 | 7.9 | 9.5 | 11.7 | 11.6 |
| 2 Black | 68.6 | 3.7 | 5.7 | 74.6 | 3.1 | 6.5 | 62.5 | 3.8 | 5.7 | 53.7 | 2.7 | 4.1 |
| 3 American Indian | | .08 | .08 | | .09 | .09 | | .33 | .31 | | .10 | .10 |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | 1.7 | .9 | .98 | 2.1 | 1.0 | 1.14 | 1.0 | 1.8 | 1.8 | 3.1 | .98 | 1.0 |
| 5 Hispanic | | .25 | .24 | | .35 | .33 | .35 | .70 | .69 | .39 | .46 | .46 |
| 6 White | 28.6 | 71.5 | 88.8 | 22.3 | 89.3 | 86.1 | 28.2 | 85.3 | 83.4 | 33.06 | 84.0 | 82.5 |
| TOTAL | 223 | 7,183 | 7,406 | 371 | 7,291 | 7,662 | 283 | 8,170 | 8,453 | 251 | 8,364 | 8,615 |

directly to the undergraduate percentages since each of these states contain one or more Traditionally Black Institutions (TBIs ) which would account for some increase in out-of-state undergraduate students. Also, our full-time undergraduate count includes two- and four-year colleges. At the graduate level it is clear from Table 1 that the TBIs in these states do not contribute as greatly to black graduate enrollment. The important issues here, however, are that: these five states collectively represent a substantial source of potential black graduate students--up to 24% in 1982, and; these five states represent a smaller but substantial source of potential doctoral candidates--up to 8% in 1982. It is also important that despite overall declines in black full-time enrollment at the national level, the public institutions in these states increased their shares of black full-time enrollment at each level.

Table 2 provides the summary statistics for doctoral degree attainment by race and ethnicity for each of the five states and for these states collectively for 1975-76, 1976-77, 1978-79 and 1980-81.

The bottom panel of Table 2 presents the summary data for earned doctorates in these states. Overall, there has been very little fluctuation in total doctorates awarded. A total of 47 doctorate degrees separate the lowest and highest yearly totals--2081 vs. 2128--while the 1975-76 and 1980-81 counts differ by only 8--2128 in 1975-76 compared to 2120 for 1980-81.

The overall consistency in the doctoral degree count masks the rather distinct distributions across race groups. In these states for

**TABLE 2**

**PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF EARNED DOCTORATES BY RACE/ETHNICITY IN TRADITIONALLY BLACK AND WHITE PUBLIC COLLEGES, 1975-76 TO 1980-81**

| Race/Ethnicity / College Racial Heritage | 1975-76 | | | 1976-77 | | | 1978-79 | | | 1980-81 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | TBI | TWI | TOTAL | TBI | TWI | TOTAL | TBI | TWI | TOTAL | TBI | TWI | TOTAL |
| **ARKANSAS** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non Resident Alien | | .8% | .8% | | 4% | 4% | | 5% | 5% | | 15% | 15% |
| 2 Black | | 4% | 4% | | 3% | 3% | | 4% | 4% | | 3% | 3% |
| 3 American Indian | | .8% | .8% | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | | 4% | 4% | | 2% | 2% | | 5% | 5% | | | |
| 5 Hispanic | | | | | 3% | 3% | | 1% | 1% | | | |
| 6 White | | 90% | 90% | | 89% | 89% | | 84% | 84% | | 82% | 82% |
| TOTAL | | 120 | 120 | | 106 | 106 | | 93 | 93 | | 105 | 105 |
| **FLORIDA** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non Resident Alien | | 6% | 6% | | 13% | 13% | | 12% | 12% | | 10% | 10% |
| 2 Black | | 5% | 5% | | 6% | 6% | | 4% | 4% | | 5% | 5% |
| 3 American Indian | | .3% | .3% | | .3% | .3% | | .3% | .3% | | .3% | .3% |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | | 3% | 3% | | .4% | .4% | | 2% | 2% | | .3% | .3% |
| 5 Hispanic | | 2% | 2% | | 1% | 1% | | .1% | .1% | | 2% | 2% |
| 6 White | | 84% | 84% | | 79% | 79% | | 80% | 80% | | 82% | 82% |
| TOTAL | | 693 | 693 | | 695 | 695 | | 713 | 713 | | 697 | 697 |
| **GEORGIA** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non Resident Alien | | .4% | .4% | | | | | 13% | 13% | | 13% | 13% |
| 2 Black | | 4% | 4% | | 2.3% | 2.3% | | 5% | 5% | | 5% | 5% |
| 3 American Indian | | .4% | .4% | | .2% | .2% | | .5% | .5% | | | |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | | .9% | .9% | | 1.3% | 1.3% | | 1.2% | 1.2% | | .7% | .7% |
| 5 Hispanic | | .9% | .9% | | .2% | .2% | | .2% | .2% | | .2% | .2% |
| 6 White | | 93.3% | 93.3% | | 96% | 96% | | 80% | 80% | | 81% | 81% |
| TOTAL | | 445 | 445 | | 440 | 440 | | 413 | 413 | | 436 | 436 |
| **OKLAHOMA** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non Resident Alien | | 11% | 11% | | 13% | 13% | | 16% | 16% | | 23% | 23% |
| 2 Black | | 2% | 2% | | 2% | 2% | | 6% | 6% | | 3% | 3% |
| 3 American Indian | | .8% | .8% | | 1% | 1% | | .7% | .7% | | 1% | 1% |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | | .3% | .3% | | .5% | .5% | | 1% | 1% | | 2% | 2% |
| 5 Hispanic | | .8% | .8% | | 1% | 1% | | .5% | .5% | | .5% | .5% |
| 6 White | | 85% | 85% | | 82.3% | 82.3% | | 76% | 76% | | 70% | 70% |
| TOTAL | | 395 | 395 | | 373 | 373 | | 395 | 395 | | 353 | 353 |
| **VIRGINIA** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non Resident Alien | | 3.4% | 3.4% | | 6.2% | 6.2% | | 8.0% | 8.0% | | 11.0% | 11.0% |
| 2 Black | | 4.0% | 4.0% | | 3.9% | 3.9% | | 5.4% | 5.4% | | 3.6% | 3.6% |
| 3 American Indian | | | | | | | | | | | .2% | .2% |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | | 1.5% | 1.5% | | 1.1% | 1.1% | | 2.0% | 2.0% | | .2% | .2% |
| 5 Hispanic | | .2% | .2% | | .2% | .2% | | | | | | |
| 6 White | | 90.9% | 90.9% | | 88.7% | 88.7% | | 84.6% | 84.6% | | 85.1% | 85.1% |
| TOTAL | | 475 | 475 | | 467 | 467 | | 499 | 499 | | 529 | 529 |
| **SUMMARY** | | N | | | N | | | N | | | N | |
| 1 Non Resident Alien | | 107 | 5.0% | | 171 | 8.2% | | 250 | 11.8% | | 284 | 13.4% |
| 2 Black | | 86 | 4.0% | | 78 | 3.7% | | 101 | 4.8% | | 91 | 4.3% |
| 3 American Indian | | 8 | .4% | | 8 | .4% | | 7 | .3% | | 8 | .4% |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | | 36 | 1.7% | | 18 | .9% | | 37 | 1.8% | | 14 | .7% |
| 5 Hispanic | | 21 | 1.0% | | 19 | .9% | | 18 | .9% | | 15 | .7% |
| 6 White | | 1870 | 87.9% | | 1787 | 85.9% | | 1700 | 80.5% | | 1708 | 80.6% |
| TOTAL | | 2128 | 2128 | | 2081 | 2081 | | 2113 | 2113 | | 2120 | 2120 |

the reported time period, the proportion of doctorates earned by whites declined steadily from 87.9% to 80.6%. The proportion of the awarded doctorates earned by blacks increased only slightly from 4% to 4.3% with a high of 4.8% in 1978-79, the first year of full response to the Adams criteria. Most noticeable is the steadily increasing share of doctorates awarded to Non-Resident Aliens. As Table 2 shows their share of doctorates increased from about 5% in 1975-76 to 13.4% by 1980-81, a 265% increase.

Still another indication of the contribution of the public colleges in these states to earned doctorates is their share of all doctorates awarded overall. Using figures for 1975-76 and 1980-81 the following chart shows the relevant comparisons.

Chart 1: Earned Doctorates by Race in Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Oklahoma, Virginia and the Nation: 1975-76 and 1980-81

| | 1975-76 | | | 1980-81 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Adams | National | % of National | Adams | National | % of National |
| Black | 86 | 1169 | 7.4% | 91 | 1265 | 7.2% |
| White | 1870 | 26,644 | 7.0% | 1708 | 25,908 | 6.6% |
| Total | 2128 | 34,334 | 6.2% | 2120 | 33,941 | 6.2 |

National data are from Trent, 1984(b)

Chart 1 shows that overall these five states experienced no change in their share of all awarded doctorates; a slight decrease in the share of doctorates awarded to blacks although the actual count of doctorates earned by blacks increased somewhat (86 to 91 in these states, a 5.8% gain; and 1169 to 1265 nationally an 8.2% gain) at both levels, and; a somewhat larger decrease in the share of

doctorates awarded to whites--about .4%--an actual decline of 736 doctoral degrees.

Finally, when we contrast bachelor degree contributions with doctorate contributions, paralleling our undergraduate and graduate enrollment comparisons, the degree differences are not as disparate as are the enrollment differences. Chart 2 below presents the bachelor degree comparisons.

Chart 2: Earned Bachelor's Degrees in Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Virginia and in the Nation 1975-76, 1980-81

| | 1975-76 | | | 1980-81 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Adams | National | % of National | Adams | National | % of National |
| Black | 5379 | 58,253 | 9.2% | 5619 | 60,673 | 9.3% |
| White | 57,790 | 802,799 | 7.2% | 47,459 | 807,334 | 7.1% |
| Total | 65,177 | 922,507 | 7.1% | 66,885 | 935,161 | 7.2% |

National Totals are From Trent 1984(a)

Comparing charts 1 and 2 for blacks only, we see that these five states contribute nearly as well at the doctorate degree level as they do at the bachelor degree level and that for both levels their degree shares were fairly consistent from 1975-76 to 1980-81. The degree data are in sharp contrast however to the enrollment data where black undergraduate enrollment exceeds comparable graduate enrollment by about 3 to 1.

These descriptive data show that collectively, the five states included in this report are an important and vital source of graduate level educational opportunity. First, the public colleges in these states enrolled over 20% of black full-time undergraduates, the primary pool from which subsequent graduate enrollment would come.

Second, public colleges in these five states enrolled at least 7% of full-time graduate students during the time period covered. Third, the earned degree data demonstrate that the public colleges in these states contributed at least 9% of bachelor degrees--the actual availability pool--and more than 7% of the doctorates earned by blacks for the period covered. For these three reasons, it is very important that we better understand operational responses to Adams at the state and campus level. We turn next to a description of each state.

## Arkansas

### System Structure

The State of Arkansas has one major institution which offers the doctorate, The University of Arkansas - Fayetteville. Other four year institutions are: Arkansas State University (ASU), Arkansas Technical University (ATU), Henderson State University (HSU), Southern Arkansas University (SAU), University of Arkansas at Little Rock (UALR), University of Arkansas at Monticello (UAM), University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff (UAPB), University of Arkansas Medical Center (UAMC), University of Central Arkansas (CA), and Arkansas State University at Beebe (ASUB).

At the system level there is the Arkansas Department of Higher Education located in the state capital of Little Rock. Therefore programs designed to aid in the retention of black graduates at the doctoral level are expected to be developed either at the Arkansas State Department of Education or at the University of Arkansas, Fayetteville. Coordinated efforts to assist black undergraduates in applying to graduate school have been implemented. Institutions who offer graduate degrees identify black students who expect to graduate with the baccalaureate and encourage them to pursue graduate study. Individual institutions also host Graduate and Professional School Days for their students. A review of the 1984 plan submitted to the U.S. Department of Education reveals that most of the efforts to eliminate the dual system has been primarily at the undergraduate level. Efforts have also focused on the hiring of black faculty and administrators throughout the state.

One major effort aimed at increasing the number of minority persons with doctorates was initiated in 1985. The state funded Faculty/Administrators Development Fellows Program was designed to assist minority faculty members employed in higher education settings in returning to school to pursue doctoral study. The Program is coordinated at the state level.

## Historical Background

In January 1969, the Governor of the State of Arkansas was notified that compliance reviews conducted by the U.S. Office for Civil Rights indicated that Arkansas and nine other states were operating systems of higher education that were racially segregated on a statewide basis and were in violation of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The Governor charged the Arkansas Department of Higher Education (ADHE) with the responsibility for development of a plan which would eliminate the dual system of higher education in Arkansas. During the next six months, state officials prepared and submitted a plan.

No further word was received from the Office for Civil Rights until the spring of 1973 when the Governor was notified that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (DHEW) was required by order of the U.S. District Court in the District of Columbia to, ". . commence enforcement proceedings by administrative notice of hearings, or utilize any other means authorized by law, to affect compliance with Title VI. . ." of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 by the ten states which had been previously identified as operating dual systems of higher education. The state was requested to prepare another plan which was eventually approved by the Office for Civil

Rights in June 1974 due to the cooperative efforts of ADHE, the Office of the Governor, and the state colleges and universities.

During the period between June 1974 and the spring of 1977, the various elements of the plan were implemented and considerable progress was made. In the spring of 1977, the Governor was notified that new guidelines for the development of state desegregation plans were being prepared by DHEW and that new plans would be requested from the states once the guidelines were complete. The guidelines were completed and received by the state in July 1977. Upon receipt of the guidelines, ADHE promptly began work on preparation of a new plan which would respond to these guidelines.

The first step taken in preparing a new plan was to form an Advisory Committee to work with staff members of ADHE. This committee consisted of forty (40) members with half being institutional employees designated by the presidents and chancellors and the other half non-institutional representatives residing throughout the state. The makeup of the committee was representative of each geographic section of the state and its racial composition was 47.5% black and 52.5% white.

The revised plan was accepted by DHEW as meeting the requirements of Title VI and the amended criteria of the DHEW in February 1978. However, the State of Arkansas was required to submit additional information before the plan could receive final approval. With the submission of a program duplication study, employment goals for non-academic employees, a labor market analysis, revised institutional role and scope statements, institutional measures, a letter from the Governor, and an addendum to the plan which included

a letter from the Chairman of the State Board of Higher Education, the Arkansas Desegregation Plan (ADP) received unconditional approval from DHEW in May 1979.

Arkansas colleges and universities immediately began implementation of the measures to achieve the objectives included with the plan. Special attention was placed on the recruitment and retention of black students and faculty. Black student enrollment was a concern because the proportion of black students enrolled at traditionally white institutions had declined each year since 1976. Since plan implementation, modest gains have been made in the employment of black faculty and staff. Arkansas colleges' and universities' ability to attract and retain black faculty is the most difficult goal to comply with. All plan goals were to be accomplished by academic year 1982-83 and although significant progress has been made, much remains for the goals of the ADP to be achieved.

In January 1983, the Governor was notified by the Department of Education (DOE; formerly the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare) that vestiges of racial segregation that gave rise to Arkansas' obligation to develop a statewide higher education desegregation plan continued to exist and that further action had to be taken to eliminate these vestiges. The DOE requested that the State of Arkansas agree to extend its Plan through the 1985-86 academic year and to develop additional programs, activities, and measures that hold the promise of achieving full compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act as soon as possible, but in any event no later than the end of the 1985-86 academic year. The State

of Arkansas prepared and submitted an addendum to the plan in the summer of 1983 which was approved by the DOE in October 1983. The addendum addresses enhancement of programs and facilities at the University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff (UAPB) and recruitment and retention of black students and faculty at traditionally white institutions.

The ADHE prepares an assessment of institutional progress each year. The ADHE also visits selected institutions to monitor implementation of the Plan.

The guidelines developed by the Office for Civil Rights (OCR) included only one specific criterion on which states were to be evaluated in terms of their progress made in increasing the number of blacks pursuing graduate and professional study. Specifically, Section VI.C mandated that states were to adopt the goals that the proportion of black state residents who graduate from undergraduate institutions in the state system and enter graduate study or professional schools in the state system shall be at least equal to the proportion of white state residents who graduate from undergraduate institutions in the state system and enter such schools (Criterion II.C, p. 23). (See Appendix C).

Only those who enter graduate school in the year after graduating from an Arkansas undergraduate state institution are reported in the OCR data and used for comparisons in assessing overall gains. For example, the 1983 response from the OCR to the State of Arkansas indicated that in 1976 the proportion of black state residents graduating from the nine public four-year institutions was eleven (11) percent. In the fall of that year,

however, the proportion of black students entering graduate and professional programs in seven institutions was 6.7%; therefore, Arkansas was 4.3% below the expected goal.

Financial Support for Graduate Study

In March of 1985, the Arkansas General Assembly authorized the only financial assistance program targeted specifically for doctoral students. Act 229 of 1985 authorized the establishment of a faculty/administrator development fellows program. The program was developed to "assist state institutions of higher education in increasing the academic qualifications, of minority faculty, administrators, other employees and alumni and prepare them for higher levels of faculty and administrative responsibility." A total of $175,000 was approved to support the program. The "Faculty/Administrator Development Fellows Program" is to be administered by the Arkansas Department of Higher Education (ADHE). The ADHE is to provide matching funds to assist state institutions in funding selected faculty, administrators and other employees who are members of racial minority groups and who pursue full-time in residence doctoral study at other institutions. During this fellowship period the Fellow is to remain a full-time employee of the institution and therefore be eligible to receive salary and other fringe benefits provided by the institution. Stipulations of the fellowship indicate that fellows must have been employed by the sponsoring institution for at least two years prior to beginning graduate study and are under contract to return to the sponsoring institution as full-time employees for three academic years immediately upon the completion of study under the Program. The

Faculty/Administrator Development Fellow is responsible for tuition fees and all other costs related to his or her program of study.*

Arkansas is unique among the five states included in this report, having just one doctoral degree granting institution. Also, for these five states Arkansas is the only state whose response to increasing the number of black doctoral recipients is only recently funded and implemented (1984-85). Nonetheless, one feature of the Arkansas program is clear: it is constructed as an affirmative action employment vehicle while still responding to the mandate to increase the number of black doctoral recipients. Critical in its construction is the candidate pool which is drawn from current employees who have been with their host institutions for at least two years. This criterion has the effect of not expanding the availability pool of black doctoral candidates. In effect, the Arkansas response is not likely to generate, stimulate or encourage the doctoral ambitions or aspirations of black undergraduates in the states institutions.

It is obviously not possible to assess the quality of the Arkansas response at this time and the concerns raised above, regarding expanding and encouraging a larger black doctoral availability pool are at best anticipatory. Moreover, given the limitations of funding, it may be inappropriate to promote

*From summaries provided by Cynthia Moten, Arkansas Department of Higher Education and Barbara Taylor, University of Arkansas.

competition between current employees and current or recent graduates from in-state baccalaureate programs. We note, however, that this effort may not impact or strictly comply with criterion II-C of the Adams guidelines calling for black-white parity in first-time, full-time graduate enrollment. Arkansas must carefully monitor their results.

## Florida

### Historical Background

The State University System of Florida (SUSF) submitted no non-discrimination statement to comply with Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act until 1970. In June 1974 Florida's Plan for Equalizing Educational Opportunity in Public Higher Education in Florida was approved by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (now the Department of Education). Commensurate with the revised guidelines for compliance issued by DHEW in July 1977, the Florida system plan, complete with specified goals, actions and timetables was resubmitted in Fall 1977. In February 1978 the plan was approved and accepted for implementation.

Initially the Florida response to Adams addressed only the State University System (four-year campuses) but was revised (1977) to include the two-year institutions. In 1977 there were four Florida institutions offering graduate programs at the doctorate level in selected fields (University of Florida, University of South Florida, Florida Atlantic University, and Florida State University) with three institutions offering professional degree programs. Each of the nine four-year institutions within the state system offers a range of graduate degree programs at the master's level. Also Florida has one traditionally black institution, Florida Agricultural and Mechanical, which at the time of approval of the Revised Plan (1977) offered no degree beyond the master's level.

Florida's response to the HEW guidelines addressed three broad areas:

1) mission and enhancement of the traditionally black institutions;

2) enrollment and progression of black students from first-time-in-college through graduate and professional schools;

3) the representation of blacks on governing boards and on the faculties and staffs of universities and governing boards.

For this report, we focus solely on the second of these broad areas and specifically on the enrollment and progression of blacks at the graduate level.

In response to HEW (DOE) criterion IIC (Increased Enrollments in Graduate and Professional Programs) SUSF adopted the following goal:

> To enroll from the state University System institutions first time graduate and professional students in black/white proportions which approximate the black/white proportions of students who graduate with bachelor's degrees and appropriate academic majors from institutions within the State University System. Each institution will make an equitable contribution toward meeting this goal within each of its major fields of graduate and professional studies.

In addition, SUSF provided six (6) "Special Affirmations and Actions in Support of Student Goals," the first four of which are of special merit here as they specifically address graduate training.

Each Action Form states a specific action to be taken, the steps to achieving the action, and designates responsibility--system and institutional--by position for achievement of the action along with a time schedule. Action Form One, for example, described "Plans to Increase Black Student Enrollment at All Levels," specifying that:

> ". . . each of the professional schools and major graduate areas will strive to enroll Black students at least approximating the same proportion of Black students graduating with Bachelor's Degrees with appropriate majors within the State University System."

In addition, the fourth 'Technique' reads as follows:

> Graduate student: Each University will fully describe efforts to increase Black student enrollment in graduate and professional programs giving due consideration to increasing black enrollments in academic programs where Black students are few in number. The plan should delineate the liaison activities of graduate programs with appropriate undergraduate feeder programs throughout the System and identify potential sources of students.

For this Action Form, the SUSF central office's responsibility was ". . . to insure that all potential applicants to the SUSF will be at least equally informed, and to assist institutions with recruitment efforts," which they accomplished by developing a single recruitment brochure promoting academic programs and the uniqueness of each institution. It is Action Forms Two and Three, however, which are central to this research as they constitute the core of the SUSF response.

> Action Form Two: Program to Increase Black Graduate Students Within the State University System
>
> Action
>
> To the extent appropriated by the Legislature, educational grants will be provided to increase the number of Black graduate students in the State University System and to encourage the recruitment of these Black graduate students into disciplines and professional programs of high demand where the number of Blacks is extremely low. Each University may nominate recipients for this award, in accordance with a Systemwide analysis of academic programs where Blacks are few in number, or not enrolled. Students may be nominated by institutions not having advanced graduate programs in the chosen discipline but who have been admitted to another State University system institution.

Action Form Three: Board of Regents Special Summer Program for Black Graduate and Professional Students

Action

Upon funding by the Legislature, implementation of a special summer program at the University of Florida designed to increase the enrollment of Black graduate and professional students in the State University system. The program is designed as a pre-start retention program to introduce participants to the career options and requirements in their chosen field of study, while advising and assisting the participants on a one-to-one basis in overcoming academic deficiencies during the summer quarter. Priority for participation will be given to State University System graduates.

In May 1983 the SUS of Florida submitted an addendum to the Office for Civil Rights of the U.S. Department of Education in response to a letter of evaluation from that office in January 1983 and April 1983. That correspondence requested more specifically articulated policies and activities to improve progress toward goal achievement and monitoring of such progress. Further, a March 1983 order from the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, the OCR, requested that Florida extend the State Plan through the fall of 1985. That addendum "restates the System's intention and details additional specificity of action, rate of implementation, and reporting and monitoring procedures which will be undertaken. . . ." Below we examine some evidence on the execution of these action forms and the renewed commitments. Table F1 reports the summary of state expenditures for each Action Form from 1975-76 through 1984-85.

The Florida State University System (SUS) response to these specific requirements for graduate study has been mainly in the form

of two Grant-in-Aid programs (Table F1, line #8), and a Special Summer Program (Table F1, line #3). The Grant-in-Aid program for graduate students was implemented in 1975-76 (originally this was named the Regents Grant for black graduate students) with funding for approximately twenty-three (23) grants, each with a value of $4,500 and a total dollar value of $103,500. This funding level remained constant through the 1982-83 academic year. Sixty-six (66) students received aid in the 1983-84 school year with each grant valued at $5,000 (for a total of $315,000). From its inception the Grants-in Aid program has been available to both graduate and professional students, with some special emphasis on selected graduate programs but not a state mandated preference for designated fields.

The anticipated budget increase for 1984-85 is $125,000, all of which is expected to go to the Grar -in-Aid Program for students, increasing the number of grants by twenty-five (25).

The Grant-in-Aid Program can be supplemented with other funds from both public and private sources but the SUS office does not participate in the additional/supplemental aid decisions which are made at the campus level. The Grant-in-Aid may be kept or continued with satisfactory progress and they are not based soley on merit or need. While the Grant-in-Aid may be continued, the original intent of the program was to increase black graduate and professional student enrollment and hence the first direction of the program established that the priority would be for new students with the students' institution picking up the cost in subsequent years.

TABLE F-1

Summary of EEO Allocations by Action Form
1974-75 to 1984-85

| ACTION FORM | 1975-76 | 1976-77 | 1977-78 | 1978-79 | 1979-80 | 1980-81 | 1981-82 | 1982-83 | 1983-84 | 1984-85 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 - Procedures for Determining Impact of Specific Actions (program continued in Monitoring and Measuring Activities) | 7,223 | 1,000 | 5,000 | 5,000 | 10,243 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 28,466 |
| 2 - Establishment of a Viable Role, FAMU* (commitment incorporated in Cooperative Programs and primarily continued in regular SUS legislative budget) | 501,343 | 304,891 | 206,394 | 107,000 | 40,000 | 124,200** | 61,000*** | 45,000 | 52,581 | 55,917 | 1,498,326 |
| 3 - Resources (deleted) New Action Form 3: BOR Special Summer Program | -- | -- | -- | 12,500 | 162,786 | 36,500 | 256,040 | 235,555 | 282,393 | 342,000 | 1,327,774 |
| 4 - Incentive Grant Program, FAMU (commitment continued through program phase out) | 165,000 | 290,500 | 339,501 | 223,300 | 107,670 | 32,200 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1,158,171 |
| 5 - Visiting Scholars Program, FAMU (deleted) | 30,000 | 30,000 | 30,000 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 90,000 |
| 6 - Renovation of FAMU (program commitment continued) | | | | | | | FUNDED THROUGH FCO | | | | -- |
| 7 - Coordinated Recruitment of Students (continued at institutional level) | -- | 8,000 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 8,000 |
| 8 - Grants-in-Aid--Faculty, Students and Staff (continued) | 190,840 | 193,266 | 194,933 | 267,066 | 256,998 | 262,000 | 263,700 | 273,250 | 485,600 | 485,600 | 2,873,253 |

*Excludes funding in an amount exceeding one million dollars above the formula-generated base for new program implementation. Since 1981, Florida A&M University has been maintained at a higher level than that which would have been realized based on actual enrollments.
**Includes $10,000 to facilitate academic programs transfer.
***Includes $16,000 for Health Careers Opportunity Program.

Source: State University System Annual Report: 1984.

TABLE F-1

Summary of EEO Allocations by Action Form
1974 - 75 to 1984 - 85
(Continued)

| ACTION FORM | 1975-76 | 1976-77 | 1977-78 | 1978-79 | 1979-80 | 1980-81 | 1981-82 | 1982-83 | 1983-84 | 1984-85 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 9 - Coordinator of Financial Aid (deleted) | 3,000 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 3,000 |
| 10 - System Attrition Study (continued) | 9,250 | 1,500 | 10,400 | 10,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 65,857 | 70,000 | 40,000 | 44,000 | 281,007 |
| 11 - Retention Programs (continued) | 15,000 | 37,000 | 270,000 | 351,000 | 382,716 | 439,000 | 478,179 | 480,179 | 495,179 | 502,179 | 3,450,432 |
| 12 - Sensitizing Workshops (deleted) | 60,000 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 60,000 |
| 13 - Recruitment of Faculty (continued in central office budget) | 57,868 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 57,868 |
| 14 - Voluntary Transfer Program (deleted) | -- | 46,582 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 46,582 |
| 15 - Faculty Retraining (program partially incorporated in Grants-in-Aid Program for Faculty) | 12,000 | 9,000 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 21,000 |
| 16 - Monitoring and Measuring of Progress (continued) | 34,751 | 96,597 | 42,523 | 51,412 | 112,640 | 136,100 | 65,604 | 83,691 | 121,922 | 76,979 | 822,219 |
| 17 - Establishment of Employee Goals (continued) | 29,800 | 18,000 | 44,139 | 120,279 | 111,947 | 155,000 | 35,000 | 50,000 | 60,000 | 51,000 | 675,165 |
| 18 - Numerical Goals, Student (continued in Monitoring and Measuring Activities) | 12,800 | 500 | 4,600 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 17,900 |
| 19 - Community Discrimination (deleted) | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| -- Institute of Education Precollegiate Program (part of the 1983 Extended Plan) | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 100,000 | 100,000 | 200,000 |
| TOTAL | 1,128,875 | 1,036,936 | 1,147,490 | 1,147,557 | 1,200,009 | 1,200,000 | 1,225,380 | 1,237,675 | 1,637,675 | 1,657,675 | 12,619,161 |

PdeH/jw/7
12/83

Tables F-2 and F-3 show the 1981-82 and 1983-84 distribution of the participants in the graduate Grant-in-Aid program.

A second effort, the Employee Grant-in-Aid Program, was implemented initially to assist blacks in obtaining the terminal degree. The Employee Grant-in-Aid Program now includes other minorities and women who may be academic faculty, professionals or other administrative and career service staff. This program was implemented under Action Form Nine which called for an increase in the number of blacks qualified for advancement in any one of the four employment areas. The Employee Grant-in-Aid Program currently assists women and other minorities with the stipulation that each recipient remains employed within the SUSF for a period of at least twice the length of the educational leave time given to the employee.

The program was initially funded in 1979 at approximately $170,000 annually. These funds are used as "replacement" monies to assist the recipients' institution in replacing her/him during the educational leave period. Each recipient receives one (1) year of leave with salary and a contribution from the Employee Grant-in-Aid. The recipients' institution receives a maximum of $17,200; $16,000 is for temporary replacement of the person on leave and $1,200 goes to the recipient to defray her/his educational expenses.

One hundred fourteen SUSF employees have received educational leave since the program's inception in 1979 as Grant-in-Aid recipients. The SUS office reports that through academic year 1983-84 the total funding level has reached $689,198. Also, the SUS

Table F-2

Student Grant-in-Aid Program Participants as Percent of Black Student Enrollment in Graduate and Professional Programs Fall, 1981

| Discipline | SUS Black Enrollment | Percent Black of Total Enrollment | Participants as Percent of Black Enrollment in SUS # | % |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| First Professional | | | | |
| Pharmacy | 22 | 57.8 | 2 | 9.1 |
| Law | 66 | 4.4 | 3 | 4.5 |
| Medicine | 50 | 7.5 | 4 | 8.0 |
| Veterinary Medicine | 3 | 1.0 | 2 | 66.7 |
| Graduate Programs | | | | |
| Psychology | 48 | 6.1 | 4 | 8.3 |
| Business Administration | 39 | 3.8 | 2 | 5.1 |
| Public Administration | 47 | 13.1 | 2 | 4.3 |
| Allied Health Services | 30 | 5.0 | 1 | 3.3 |
| Music | 6 | 4.0 | 2 | 33.3 |
| Computer Science | 5 | 3.7 | 1 | 20.0 |
| Overall Representation in First Professional Programs | *150 | 5.5 | 11 | 7.3 |
| Overall Representation in Graduate Programs | *807 | 5.5 | 12 | 1.5 |
| Total Representation in Graduate Study | *957 | 5.5 | 23 | 2.4 |

*Represents Fall Semester enrollment, only.

Source: Annual Report of Progress 1981-82 Board of Regents, Office for Equal Opportunity Programs. State University System of Florida, Tallahassee, Florida p. 36.

Table F-3

Graduate Student Grants-in-Aid Program Participants
as a Percentage of Black Student Enrollment
in Graduate and Professional Programs
Fall 1983

| Discipline | SUS Black Enrollment | Percent Black of Total Enrollment | Participants as Percent of Black Enrollment in SUS* # | % |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| First Professional | | | | |
| Pharmacy | 30 | 75.0 | 3 | 10.0 |
| Law | 80 | 5.3 | 4 | 5.0 |
| Dentistry | 11 | 3.7 | 3 | 27.3 |
| Medicine | 50 | 6.1 | 8 | 16.0 |
| Veterinary Medicine | 4 | 1.3 | 1 | 25.0 |
| Graduate Programs | | | | |
| Psychology | 45 | 5.6 | 7 | 15.5 |
| Business and Management | 87 | 2.9 | 12 | 13.7 |
| Education | 342 | 6.7 | 15 | 4.3 |
| Other | 244 | 8.7 | 13 | 5.3 |
| Overall Black Representation in First Professional Programs | 175 | 5.8 | 19 | 10.9 |
| Overall Black Representation in Graduate Programs | 718 | 4.1 | 47 | 6.5 |
| Total Black Representation in Graduate and Professional Study | 893 | 4.3 | 66 | 7.3 |

*Universities' 1983-84 annual reports

Source: Annual Report of Prograss 1982-83 Board of Regents, Office for Equal Opportunity Programs. State University System of Florida, Tallahassee, Florida, p. 36.

office reports that about thirty-six (36) recipients, or 32%, have completed their educational programs and that twenty-five (25) of those completing their programs have been promoted within the state system.

The third initiative undertaken by Florida for the support of graduate level students is the Special Summer Program which began in 1978-79 funded at $12,500. The program in 1984 was funded at $342,000. The SUSF Special Summer Program is for new, entering graduate and professional students each of whom receives a grant ranging from $1,300 to $1,500 to help defray the cost of tuition and living expenses. Students are enrolled full-time during the regular academic year. For the summer of 1983 there were 101 pre-law and pre-graduate students enrolled in this special summer transitional program on the university campuses. This represented an increase on five (5) students over the summer 1982 total.

Recruitment

The State University System does not provide direct financial support for the recruitment of minority graduate students. The individual campuses use a variety of strategies in the recruitment of minority students for graduate study. By far the most elaborate recruitment strategies are those of the University of Florida where faculty and students participate in a well-conceived recruitment program which entails university financed, pre-arranged visits to selected campuses--especially historically black institutions--where substantial numbers of minority students are enrolled. Faculty members are invited to volunteer for two- to three-day visits, are accompanied by minority graduate students, are trained prior to the

scheduled visit and are supplied with well-designed informational packets to be distributed to students during their visits. The office of the director of the program (Acting Assistant Dean for Graduate Studies) administers this recruitment program including all details of initial institution contacts, scheduling, travel and accommodations, packet preparation and training.

The University of South Florida, partly in response to the OCR letter of January 1983 to Governor Graham, has initiated or planned the implementation of many of the same recruitment practices. These initiatives also correspond to the appointment of an Assistant Dean for Graduate Studies with primary responsibility for the administration of the minority graduate student commitments.

Support Services

The SUS of Florida does not provide direct funding for special support services to minority graduate students beyond the special summer program for pre-graduate and professional students. Those support services which are available on the different campuses reflect the individual campus and departmental responses to the needs of their students.

The support services identified by respondents include: Minority Graduate and Professional Student Organization; Minority Graduate Student faculty advisors; periodic meetings with graduate school staff; the Ad Hoc Minority Graduate Student Recruitment and Advisory Committee; the traditional on-campus counseling service; and departmental tutors.

Florida offers both a well conceived statewide plan and at least one well conceived campus based initiative. The states' response in

terms of funding for black doctoral candidates is both affirmative with respect to employees and generative with respect to expanding the availability pool of black doctoral candidates. The Florida plan has also been responsive to supporting certain special services as evidenced by the Board of Regents Summer Program. The financial support provided by Florida is not retentive however, although it is renewable. The emphasis in Florida has been on black-white parity in graduate enrollment based on in-state black-white baccaluareate degree rates. Such an emphasis is in direct compliance with Criterion II-C of Adams but the non-retentiveness of the financial aid could contribute to some instability for students planning their graduate careers, or what we refer to as "revolving door programs" at the undergraduate level. We found no direct evidence of this phenomena in our interviews nor in the state and campus based reports but administrators at each level were sensitive to this potentiality.

There was considerable variability among Florida's campuses both in the administrative structure and the comprehensiveness of services. While each of the doctoral granting institutions is participating in the state funded programs, the plan and its administration is most visible at the University of Florida. The recruitment activities of the University of Florida are of special merit in that they involve university faculty and graduate students and they also focus on historically black colleges, the location of the largest pool of potential black graduate students.

It is also important to note that Florida's Plan supports approximately 75 black doctoral candidates when the employee and student grant-in-aid funds are combined. Both programs have been

available since 1979 but the annual number of black doctoral recipients since that time has remained fairly stable. It is important for Florida to investigate those factors associated with the difficulty of increasing its number of doctoral recipients given its level of support.

## Georgia

### System Structure

There are thirty-three (33) institutions in the public higher education system of Georgia, fifteen two-year institutions and eighteen four-year institutions. Three of the four-year public institutions are historically black institutions. They are: Fort Valley State College, Albany State College and Savannah State College. Four of the four-year institutions, the University of Georgia, Georgia State University, Georgia Institute of Technology, and the Georgia Medical School, have doctoral programs.

The university system is governed by a fifteen-member Board of Regents. These members are appointed by the Governor. There are ten members each of which represents one of the ten congressional districts. Five members are appointed from the state at large.

In the state of Georgia both the system and individual institutions have programs to encourage black undergraduate students to pursue graduate degrees. Funding provided to students may be awarded from the state or at some institutions from internal non state funds.

### Historical Background - Desegregation Plan

The initial state plan was developed during the period from 1969-1973 but was not accepted until early 1973. Commitment and pressure from the general administration was instrumental in obtaining cooperation at the graduate department level. The plan was revised in 1977 and amendments were prepared in 1983 and 1984. In the March 1978 plan, the Board of Regents adopted as a goal the continued parity of black and white state residents who graduate from

undergraduate institutions and enter graduate institutions in the Georgia system. While the black enrollment in graduate programs in 1977 exceeded the proportionate graduate rates for blacks at the bachelors levels, it was found that blacks were underrepresented in certain disciplines. In the 1978 plan, enrollment goals were established for twenty-three disciplines through 1982.

In the 1977 plan the commitment was made to seek legislation and state funding of $500,000 for 100 scholarships to support "economically disadvantaged graduate and professional students." This program was initiated in 1978. A subcommittee from the Regents Office was also appointed. One of the key issues was whether to merge Armstrong Southern College, a predominantly white institution and Savannah State College, a historically black institution. There was also some concern regarding how best to integrate faculty, whether faculty should be transferred and how the transfer would affect tenure considerations and regulations.

Recruitment

Several activities have been coordinated at the system level to recruit students to graduate programs. The Regents' Opportunity Scholarship Program was funded in 1978 at a level of $500,000. The program provides fellowship support to selected black students who are pursuing advanced graduate and professional degrees. The appropriation of $500,000 remained the same through the 1983-84 year. This amount was increased to $600,000 in academic year 1985. Other activities include:

(a) a computerized identification system initiated in fall 1983. Academically promising minority undergraduates with a grade

point average of 2.75 (4.00 scale) or higher attending any of the state institutions are identified early and encouraged to pursue graduate or professional study;

(b) the development of special graduate recruitment materials for each state institution offering graduate and professional programs; and

(c) minority recruitment seminars held annually. The seminars for minority students are held at each of the thirteen undergraduate state institutions. They include: Albany State College, Armstrong State College, Columbus College, Fort Valley State College, Georgia College (Arts & Sciences), Georgia College (School of Medicine), Georgia Institute of Technology, Georgia Southern College, Georgia Southwestern College, Georgia State University, North Georgia College, Savannah State College, University of Georgia, Valdosta State College, and West Georgia College. Deans or other representatives of the graduate schools are available to discuss graduate study opportunities at a particular institution.

The system also provides support for some black faculty and administrators employed at state institutions to pursue terminal graduate degrees. The award includes a maximum of three years with pay. Faculty and administrators must return to the institution and remain employed there for the equivalent of each year of leave. (See Appendix C for summary provided in the 1983 Admended Plan). As indicated below, efforts are also decentralized and vary at the campus level. Descriptions of institutional efforts follow.

## Georgia State University

Efforts to increase the number of black students enrolled in graduate programs at Georgia State University are decentralized. There is no dean of the Graduate School. There are three colleges, Education, Liberal Arts and Sciences, and Business, that offer the doctoral degree. Recruiting efforts are coordinated by the colleges. Institutional funds have not been set aside to support doctoral students. Students enrolled at Georgia State are eligible to apply for the Regent's Educational Opportunity Grant, a program funded at the system level and since 1978 have received most of the awards made to doctoral level students (see Table G-1). Because of the location, Georgia State University has a number of part-time students pursuing graduate degrees. Many of these students are employed while enrolled. The size of the black population in Atlanta, and the fact that the doctorate is awarded in most fields of education, contribute to the number of black students pursuing advanced degrees.

### Admission Criteria

The most competitive programs are psychology in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and Counseling and Psychological Services in the College of Education. Business ranks third. Some of the admission requirements are dictated by the system for those pursuing degrees in Education. The Miller Analogies Test is required for all applicants and minimum grade point averages are also required.

TABLE G-1

REGENTS' OPPORTUNITY GRANTS

Awards Made for DOCTORAL Level Programs

(Professional Programs Excluded)

1978 - 1984

| GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY | | GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY | | MEDICAL COLLEGE OF GEORGIA | | University of Georgia | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Phd | | PhD, DBA, EdD | | PhD | | PhD, DPA, EdD | |
| Mathematics | - 1 | Psychology | - 9 | Biology | - 1 | Public Admin. | - 1 |
| Information-Computer Science | - 1 | Information Systems | - 2 | | | Special Education | - 1 |
| Chemistry | 2 | Land Economics | - 2 | | | Psychology | - 5 |
| Management | 1 | School Psychology | - 1 | | | Early Childhood Education | - 1 |
| Biology | 1 | Economics | - 2 | | | Education | - 2 |
| Nuclear Engineering | 1 | Political Science | - 1 | | | Accounting | - 1 |
| | | Accounting | - 1 | | | Romance Language | - 1 |
| | | Curriculum Dev. | - 1 | | | Education Psy. | - 1 |
| | | Education Admin. | - 1 | | | Sociology | - 2 |
| | | Early Childhood Ed. | - 2 | | | | |
| | | Ed. Foundations | - 1 | | | | |
| | | Special Education | - 1 | | | | |
| | | Curriculum & Institution Education | - 1 | | | | |
| | | Ed. Leadership | - 2 | | | | |
| | | Counseling and Psychology Services | - 1 | | | | |

11/84

## The University of Georgia

The most comprehensive doctorate degree granting institution in the state is the University of Georgia. The Doctor of Philosophy is awarded in fifty-one (51) different disciplines. The Doctorate of Education is offered in thirty (30) different fields and the Doctor of Musical Arts and Public Administration are also awarded. Because of the comprehensive nature of the institution one would expect that the number of black students attending graduate programs at the University of Georgia would be higher than both the Georgia Institute of Technology and Georgia State University, but, as shown in Table G-1, this is not the case.

### Recruitment

The University of Georgia participates in the statewide activities to recruit minority students. Approximately 800 letters per year are mailed to all minority juniors with G.P.A.'s of 2.74 (4.00 - A). Materials which describe sources of financial support and graduate school information are included with the letter from the dean of the graduate school.

Institutional funds are also allocated to support masters and doctoral level students. In 1984-85, twenty-one (21) non-teaching assistantships were provided. The assistantship is one-third FTE (13 hours per week). Masters level students receive $5,356 per year. Doctoral level students (those who have completed 45 hours) receive a salary of $5,712 per year. All awardees pay in-state tuition. In 1985-86, twenty-four (24) awards were made. Master's students will receive $5,731 and doctoral students will receive $6,113 for a nine-month appointment and $7,642 to $8,150 for a twelve-month

appointment. There is a yearly competition and students are eligible to be funded for up to three years. Presently the majority of the students supported are at the masters level.

## Georgia Institute of Technology

Georgia Institute of Technology offers advanced degrees in engineering, science, management, architecture, and city planning. There are four colleges in which graduate degrees are offered. The largest is the College of Engineering. The College of Science and Liberal Studies (COSALS) has such disciplines as biology, applied biology, chemistry, physics, mathematics, information computer science, physical sciences and psychology. Clinical psychology is also offered. The College of Management offers three undergraduate programs leading to a bachelor of science in management, in management science, and in economics. Graduate work in the College leads to the Master of Science and the Doctor of Philosophy in Management. The doctoral program has low enrollment. The College of Architecture was recently authorized to offer the doctorate. There have been no degrees awarded. The first professional degree in architecture is the masters degree. No doctorate is offered in the speciality of City Planning. Because of the technical and quantitative emphasis of the programs offered, as well as employment opportunities for students with bachelors degrees, enrollment of black students at the doctoral level is small.

### Recruitment and Admission Procedures

Georgia Institute of Technology has a unique mission. It has the only comprehensive engineering program in the state. Through the centralized minority identification program, all black undergraduate juniors and seniors with a 3.00 grade point average who are pursuing science programs are contacted directly. Personal letters and graduate college information are sent to each student. The students

are also informed of the date when representatives from Georgia Tech will visit their campus to interview students.

Most recruiting is done, if at all, at the department level. Admission decisions are also decentralized and are made at the school level. Schools at Georgia Institute of Technology are similar to graduate departments at most graduate institutions.

The number of black students pursuing graduate study in management is small. Students have the choice of pursuing Business Administration at both Georgia State University and at the University of Georgia. The management programs at Georgia Institute of Technology are highly quantitative and technically oriented. Those students who are more interested in careers in business and industry rather than in academic settings may choose to pursue the terminal Masters of Business Administration rather than either of the two doctorates offered there.

Financial Assistance

As a major technically-oriented research university, Georgia Institute of Technology receives approximately only twenty percent of its revenue from the state. Most doctoral students are supported by graduate research assistantships. The minimum level of funding is $4,000 for a nine-month appointment, one-third FTE and $8,600 maximum. Tuition and fees are waived. The salary range varies by College. Georgia Institute has previously received funding from the U.S. Department of Education through the Graduate and Professional Opportunity Program (G-POP) fellowship but was not funded for the 1984-85 school year.

Perhaps one of its major contributions to increasing the number of black students pursuing the baccalaureate in engineering has been the establishment of the joint programs with several Historically Black Institutions located in Atlanta. As is the case in most technical graduate programs nationally, similar gains have not occurred at the graduate level.

Georgia administers the largest program of any of the states included in this report with a total dollar value of $600,000, accounting for approximately 120 graduate students. These monies are not constructed to be retentive, but while students must reapply annually, the states commitment is very positive.

Georgia's plan is clearly articulated to be more supportive of black students in particular major fields with target goals stated for each of 23 disciplines. These targets however are not prohibitive of students' choices.

As is true in each of the states except Arkansas, Georgia's campuses show considerable variability in the execution of the state's plan. Perhaps primarily due to differences in the offerings on each of three doctoral granting campuses, there are substantial differences in numbers of candidates. Georgia State University, for example, has a broad array of doctoral level offerings making its graduate program quite attractive. This campus also offers part-time opportunities. As a result, Georgia State University far outdistanced its more visible sister institutions--Georgia Institute of Technology and the University of Georgia--in the utilization of Regents Opportunity Grants, The University of Georgia has the most

comprehensive doctoral offerings of all the states' public institutions.

By contrast Georgia Institute of Technology has a very unique mission and its degree of specialization probably limits its role. Nonetheless, the national efforts of engineering and the technical sciences have made these fields quite attractive to minorities and contributes to their access and success in these fields. In this latter light, the black graduate numbers at the Georgia Institute of Technology appear small.

The early identification features of the recruitment activities on the part of Georgia's universities are commendable. The maintenance and distribution of minority students names and addresses is particularly useful in a state that has access to three (3) public supported, historically black colleges. Nonetheless, our figures show that for the time-period covered here, these Georgia institutions have been unable to increase the number of black doctoral recipients or to increase black graduate enrollment. Indeed, both the number of black doctorates awarded and the numbers enrolled have declined.

## Oklahoma

### System Structure

The Oklahoma State System of Higher Education is composed of thirty (30) institutions located throughout the state. There are four institutions that grant professional and higher degrees: Oklahoma University Health Sciences Center, Oklahoma State, Northeastern Oklahoma State University, and the University of Oklahoma. Black students accounted for 6.4% of the total enrollment in 1983 and 1984. In 1981 and 1982, Black students accounted for 6.2% and 6.3% of the total enrollment at Oklahoma's traditionally white institutions. Black enrollment has been within one percentage point of this level in the past six years (1984 Annual Report).

Black students are enrolled in all schools throughout the Oklahoma University System. There are, however, four institutions where the level of Black student enrollment has been more concentrated over the years. These are Roe State College (13.2%), Central State University (8.9%), Tulsa Junior College (6.3%), and Langston University (51.0%). Langston University is Oklahoma's only traditionally Black institution. Its enrollment is divided among three locations: the main campus, Tulsa, and Oklahoma City. Langston University presently is not a professional degree granting institution, nor does it offer any doctoral programs. In 1984, Langston did submit a request to the Oklahoma State Board of Regents to add two professional schools (Chiropractic and Podiatric Medicine); however, the request was deferred due to budget constraints (1984 Annual Report).

## Historical Background

The Oklahoma State Plan for Compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was initially submitted prior to 1973. A revised version of this plan was given approval in 1974 by the U.S. Office for Civil Rights. Plans initially approved in 1974, however, were found lacking pursuant to the Adams guidelines published in January 1977. Oklahoma further revised their PLAN and this was approved as of September 1977, to be fully implemented by academic year 1981-82.

We focus on Oklahoma's response to criterion II.C and II.E of the Adams' guidelines calling for increases in black degree attainment at each degree level (II.E). (See Appendix C)

Oklahoma's response to Criterion II.C and II.E are as follows:

> C. Graduate and Professional School Enrollment
>
> Plan Commitment
>
> "It is the goal of the State Regents that the proportion of black state residents who graduate from undergraduate institutions in the State System and enter graduate study or professional schools in the State System shall be at least equal to the proportion of white state residents who graduate from undergraduate institutions in the State System and enter such schools." The State also said that the "numerical goals will be based upon a comparison of the racial proportions of students earning baccalaureate degrees, with the racial proportions of students entering graduate or professional programs." (Revised State Plan, Supplement II, January 17, 1978, p. 6).
>
> E. Retention and Graduation Parity
>
> Plan Commitment
>
> "The Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education are committed to an absolute reduction of any disparity between the population of black and white students graduating with baccalaureate, master's, doctor's degrees." (Revised State Plan, September 5, 1977, p. 25).

Tables OK-1 and OK-2 provide the projections for Black first-time graduate enrollment (1978-1982) and Black degree attainment (1979-1986), respectively, expressed as black-white ratios. These projections are based on parity in black-white proportions for enrollment and degree attainment. Tables OK-3 and OK-4 provide the actual achievements in black first-time graduate enrollment and black degree attainment for 1978 through 1984 for enrollment and 1979-80 through 1983-84 for bachelor and graduate degree attainment.

Table OK-3 shows unevenness across the major field combinations but, in general, for 1982, 1983, and 1984, Oklahoma fell short of its projected enrollment ratios for black first-time graduate students. Table 3a, giving actual numbers of black first-time graduate enrollment, clearly demonstrates the year-to-year fluctuations. It is important to point out, however, that in 1981, Oklahoma's black first-time graduate enrollment met or exceeded parity in nineteen (19) of the twenty-four (24) fields listed.

Turning next to degree attainment parity, when we contrast Tables 2 and 4 we can see that black-white actual degree attainment at the doctoral level has not matched the projections. Indeed, the 1979-80 projections and actual ratios (1:24.7 vs. 1:37.6) are closer than the ratio for the most recent year for which data were available (1983-84, 1:14.1 vs. 1:46.2). Each of the interim year comparisons are much closer. It is not clear what the source of this most recent departure is.

TABLE OK-1

Projected First-Year Resident Graduate Enrollment
by Black/White Ratio and Area of Study

| MAJOR AREA OF STUDY | FALL 1978 | | FALL 1979 | | FALL 1980 | | FALL 1981 | | FALL 1982 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | RATIO | DECIMAL | RATIO | DECIMAL | RATIO | DECIMAL | RATIO | DECIMAL | RATIO | DECIMAL |
| AGRICULTURE AND NATURAL RESOURCES | 1:100 | .010 | 1:90* | .011 | 1:80* | .012 | 1:76 | .013 | 1:70 | .014 |
| ARCHITECTURE & ENVIRON. DESIGN | 1:32 | .031 | 1:25 | .040 | 1:25* | .040 | 1:18 | .056 | 1:17 | .059 |
| BIOLOGICAL STUDIES | 1:31 | .032 | 1:28 | .036 | 1:28 | .036 | 1:16 | .063 | 1:16 | .063 |
| BUSINESS AND MANAGEMENT | 1:17 | .059 | 1:15 | .067 | 1:13 | .077 | 1:10 | .100 | 1:9 | .111 |
| COMMUNICATIONS | 1:12 | .083 | 1:12* | .083 | 1:12* | .083 | 1:6 | .167 | 1:6 | .167 |
| COMPUTER & INFORMATIONAL SCIENCE | 1:11 | .091 | 1:8 | .125 | 1:8 | .125 | 1:3 | .333 | 1:3 | .333 |
| EDUCATION | 1:10 | .100 | 1:10* | .100 | 1:10 | .100 | 1:7 | .143 | 1:7 | .143 |
| ENGINEERING | 1:67 | .015 | 1:41 | .024 | 1:23 | .043 | 1:17 | .059 | 1:17 | .059 |
| FINE & APPLIED ARTS | 1:9 | .111 | 1:9* | .111 | 1:9* | .111 | 1:9 | .111 | 1:9 | .111 |
| FOREIGN LANGUAGES | 1:30 | .033 | 1:15 | .067 | 1:15* | .067 | 1:10 | .100 | 1:8 | .125 |
| HEALTH PROFESSIONS | 1:21 | .048 | 1:16 | .063 | 1:11 | .091 | 1:6 | .167 | 1:6 | .167 |
| HOME ECONOMICS | 1:18 | .056 | 1:12 | .083 | 1:10 | .100 | 1:10 | .100 | 1:9 | .111 |
| LETTERS | 1:24 | .042 | 1:24 | .042 | 1:14 | .071 | 1:8 | .125 | 1:6 | .167 |
| LIBRARY SCIENCE | 1:10 | .100 | 1:8 | .125 | 1:5 | .200 | 1:5 | .200 | 1:5 | .200 |
| MATHEMATICS | 1:15 | .067 | 1:13 | .077 | 1:13* | .077 | 1:10 | .100 | 1:8 | .125 |
| PHYSICAL SCIENCE | 1:52 | .019 | 1:32 | .031 | 1:24 | .042 | 1:20 | .050 | 1:15 | .067 |
| PSYCHOLOGY | 1:15 | .067 | 1:14 | .071 | 1:14* | .071 | 1:10 | .100 | 1:9 | .111 |
| PUBLIC AFFAIRS & SERVICE | 1:17 | .059 | 1:10 | .100 | 1:10 | .100 | 1:10 | .100 | 1:10 | .100 |
| SOCIAL SCIENCE | 1:10 | .100 | 1:10 | .100 | 1:8 | .125 | 1:6 | .167 | 1:5 | .200 |
| ALL AREAS | 1:15 | .067 | 1:15 | .067 | 1:12 | .083 | 1:9 | .111 | 1:9 | .111 |

---

*1977-78 UNDERGRADUATE PARTICIPATION RATIOS AT THESE LEVELS ARE BELOW THESE PROJECTED RATIOS. THESE AREAS WILL BE TARGETED FOR SPECIAL RECRUITMENT THE YEAR PRIOR TO THAT FALL.

SOURCE: GOALS FOR GRADUATE AND PROFESSIONAL SCHOOLS, TABLE ONE.

Source: Final Analysis for the State of Oklahoma, Exhibit 4, September 1983.

TABLE OK-2

Revised Incremental Goals to Increase Degrees Granted by Four-Year and Graduate Institutions Expressed as Black/White Ratios[a]

| Degree Year | Bachelor's Degree | Master's[b] Degree | Doctor's[c] Degree |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1979 | 1:15.6 | 1:20.9 | 1:29 |
| 1980 | 1:14.1 | 1:18.6 | 1:24.7 |
| 1981 | 1:12.1 | 1:15.6 | 1:20.9 |
| 1982 | 1:10.0 | 1:14.1 | 1:18.6 |
| 1983 | 1:10.0 | 1:12.1 | 1:15.6 |
| 1984 | 1:9.6 | 1:10.0 | 1:14.1 |
| 1985 | 1:9.3 | 1:10.0 | 1:12.1 |
| 1986 | 1:9.0 | 1:9.6 | 1:10.0 |

[a]Extrapolated from 9999 Summary of OE 2300 - 2.3 (1978) and the 1977-78 Enrollment Report by Race from the State Department of Education, dated January 5, 1978.

[b]Represents a two-year delay in equal ratios from the baccalaureate degree year.

[c]Represents a three-year delay in equal ratios from the master's degree year.

Source: Final Analysis for the State of Oklahoma, Exhibit 6, September 1983.

TABLE OK-3

Seven Years of Black Enrollments by Academic Class Level for the State System

| Classification | Fall 1978 | Fall 1979 | Fall 1980 | Fall 1981 | Fall 1982 | Fall 1983 | Fall 198- |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| First-time Freshmen | 2139 | 2257 | 2397 | 2168 | 2326 | 2326 | 2091 |
| Other Freshmen | 2102 | 2089 | 2161 | 2081 | 1916 | 2195 | 2108 |
| Sophomores | 1969 | 1771 | 1828 | 1805 | 1909 | 1976 | 2033 |
| Juniors | 833 | 828 | 884 | 803 | 946 | 1009 | 838 |
| Seniors | 796 | 801 | 815 | 863 | 865 | 1011 | 990 |
| First-time Graduates | 95 | 90 | 123 | 120 | 119 | 137 | 145 |
| Other Graduates | 351 | 365 | 327 | 392 | 424 | 447 | 478 |
| Professional | 31 | 36 | 38 | 38 | 40 | 42 | 52 |
| Unclassified | 304 | 337 | 265 | 534 | 743 | 699 | 760 |
| TOTAL | 8620 | 8574 | 8838 | 8804 | 9288 | 9842 | 9495 |

Source: OE 2300-2.3 Fall 1978-1984

Source: Compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act; Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Educaiton Annual Report, 1985, Table 3.

TABLE OK-4

A Five-Year Comparison of the Black to White Ratio of
Bachelor's and Graduate Degree Recipients in the State System

| Year | Bachelor's* | Master's | Doctor's |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1983-84 | 1:19.0 | 1:22.8 | 1:46.2 |
| 1982-83 | 1:18.2 | 1:21.8 | 1:21.0 |
| 1981-82 | 1:19.9 | 1:23.6 | 1:22.6 |
| 1980-81 | 1:20.1 | 1:23.2 | 1:22.5 |
| 1979-80 | 1:20.6 | 1:24.5 | 1:37.6 |

Source: OE 2300-2.3 (for 1979-80 through 1983-84)
Tables Four, Five, and Six

*The TBI contribution is included in these ratios

Source: Compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act; Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education Annual Report, 1985, Table 8.

The primary vehicle designed as an Adams response to increase the production of black Ph.D.'s from Oklahoma universities has been the Doctoral Study Grant Program, financial aid initiated to sustain Criterion II.E. We turn next to a discussion of that program.

Financial Aid at the Doctoral Level

The Doctoral Study Grant Program (DSGP) was initiated in January 1975 as the statewide system response to increasing the number of doctorate recipients who were black. It is the only source of financial assistance designated by the state for this purpose and since its inception has been administered by the Oklahoma Board of Regents. Since its first year of implementation, the DSGP has grown in five ways:

(1) expanded to cover dissertation;

(2) the number of years the award could be received has been extended three times (from 2 to 2 1/2 years; from 2 1/2 years to 3 years; and from 3 to 4 years;

(3) increased in dollar value; from $5,000/year to $6,000 per year;

(4) augmented by requiring a fee waiver;

(5) augmented by requiring a graduate assistantship or an apprenticeship.

These five refinements of the DSGP have occurred at different times throughout the existence of the program. In 1978 the award was approved and expanded to cover dissertation (2 1/2 years). The fee waiver requirement (the fee waiver is state money, but is not a hard money transfer in its year of use but is reflected in the host university's next budget year), worth from six to seven hundred dollars for in-state students and up to $1,600 for out-of-state students, depending on which university they enter, was added in

1980-81. An additional year of award was added in both 1983-84 and 1984-85. Also in 1984-85 the state added the assistantship/apprenticeship requirement and increased the dollar value of the basic DSGP award from $5,000 to $6,000. The net result of these extensions, expansions and additions has been to increase the value of the award from $5,000 a year in 1975 to its current maximum value of approximately $16,000. The funding level for the basic DSGP has increased from $50,000 (10 FTE's) to its current level of $120,000 (20 FTE's).

The DSGP is not solely need-based in the traditional financial aid sense but was also based, in part, on the needs of the universities and colleges in Oklahoma. In this way the program is consistent with the stated operational purpose of the effort which is to create faculty and staff for the Oklahoma State University System. Recipients are not required to stop work and it is clear, from the evolving financial aid package approach reflected in the new requirements, that the DSGP is viewed as additive and is complemented by monies from a variety of sources. Cumulatively the DSGP is worth from $40,000 to $64,000 for each recipient. The coordinator for the program estimates its total dollar value at approximately $270,000. It should also be noted that the required add-ons (fee waivers, assistantships/apprenticeships) are not actually enforceable but are cooperatively negotiated with the individual campuses. Only the basic DSGP monies are completely administered at the state system level. Importantly, however, by requiring the fee waiver and other add-ons in the aid package, the total package is tax-exempt. Finally, the award is structured as a twelve-month award.

Eligibility for the program is governed by fairly flexible criteria with respect to major fields of study, allowing the selection group to change their eligibility criteria based on the job market and institutional listings. Beyond that, the candidate should predict graduation and provide evidence of staying in Oklahoma following graduation (not a requirement of an enforceable stipulation). First preference goes to Oklahoma students with Master's degree or currently enrolled in an Oklahoma university. The DSGP is portable, meaning a student can take it out of state and out-of-state students can be recipients. The coordinator recognizes that in-state preference may be counterproductive in the sense that the Oklahoma's major universities frown on inbreeding--hiring their own--and also have considerable rivalries which mitigates against hiring one another's graduates. The system reports roughly a sixty percent retention/success rate measured by retaining graduates.

The Oklahoma Plan's financial aid package for doctoral support to blacks, while substantially smaller in basic FTE's than Florida's, has several features that recommend it as a quality approach. First, the overall flexibility is commendable. Secondly, the level of support, with the required add-ons, is quite good, tax-free and does not rule out work. Moreover, the expanded number of years for which the support is available (four years) is very good. Our key measures then, the level and length of support, the Oklahoma financial aid response is one of quality.

Admissions and Selection

When the DSGP was initiated in 1975 the admission and award process was totally in the hands of the selection committee of the

Regents with veto power held by the chancellor and the Regents themselves. At that time applicants applied directly to the State Regent's Office providing a complete set of credentials. The graduate deans on the campuses where they intended to matriculate simply verified that they were graduate students in good standing, or admitted.

The current procedures (see Exhibit OK-1, Appendix D) place more control in the hands of the graduate deans. This is consistent with the philosophical approach taken by Oklahoma which emphasizes institutionalization. In effect, procedures have changed in an effort to encourage the institutions to "own" the students and the Adams effort. The graduate deans now select their candidates and send a prioritized listing to the Regents Office. The Regents office reaches agreements with the graduate deans based on market manpower demands for certain fields. The ability to prioritize the selections, and know in advance how many slots they have, is felt to allow the deans to make firm commitments to students and use it (the DSGP) as a recruitment device. Moreover, these procedures are viewed as putting actual policy control in the hands of the graduate deans. Finally, the Regent's Office feels that this maximizes the academicians input in the administration of the program, especially with regard to selection. The payment system and certification procedures are still bureaucratic and "odious," however.

Support Services

In addition to the DSGP there are other more indirect sources of support to doctoral students, funded by the state. Three new programs provide support to students through their institutions: the

DSG Incentive Award; the Minority Graduate Incentive Grant; and, the Doctoral Scholars Award.

The DSG Incentive Award provides $1,000 to an institution for each new student recruited. For 1985, there were thirteen (13) new DSG recipients and the $13,000 was shared by three institutions. These monies can be used for recruitment, retention, direct payment to students or for other support services for the program. It is stipulated that the money must be applied to the graduate student(s).

The Minority Graduate Incentive Grant is funded at $14,000 and is divided among all graduate colleges based on their increase in minority enrollment and these monies also are to be used for recruitment, retention and support services.

A new effort for the 1984-85 year is the Doctoral Scholars Program. Five thousand dollars has been designated to be awarded to five doctoral candidates chosen by the graduate deans. There are no constraints on these monies and they are awarded on the basis of academic merit, over and above any other aid. The five doctoral scholars will participate in a scholar-leadership program and a seminar.

The coordinator of the DSGP for the Regents' office volunteers that the program does not get a consistent group of applicants each year in terms of academic quality. There is also, he reports, too much variability in recruitment, retention and graduation. He specifically recommends that funding for the DSGP be increased (more FTE's), that the institutional academic structure be granted more control over the selection process, that the program be extended to

cover five years of support and that funding for recruitment be made more systematic.

The overall quality of the Oklahoma Plan's aid to black doctoral candidates is quite good. The aid package is retentive; it is long-term, and; it is augmented with additional monies which increases its sufficiency. Further aspects of its quality are the potential support for socialization into the profession and for the encouragement of mentoring relationships. These special features add to the attractiveness of the financial aid plan in Oklahoma and should be encouraged in other states.

The most obvious problem with the Oklahoma Plan is the limited numbers of students it can support. Our data show, however, that while the actual number of doctorates awarded to blacks was only 5 in 1983-84, the enrollment of first time, full-time black graduate students had increased by 65 from 1982 to 1983 and by 8 from 1983 to 1984. (Oklahoma is one of two of the five states showing a consistent increase in black graduate enrollment since 1982). We expect, based on these data, that the quality of the aid package will produce increases in earned doctorates.

## Virginia

### System Structure

There are thirty-nine state-supported institutions of higher education of which six (6) are doctoral granting universities, nine (9) are senior colleges, twenty-three (23) are community colleges and one, (1) a two-year liberal arts college. Each institution is governed by its own independent Board of Visitors, except for Clinch Valley College (governed by the University of Virginia Board of Vistors). All two-year community colleges are governed by the State Board of Community Colleges. The State Council of Higher Education was created in 1956 by the General Assembly of Virginia and serves to coordinate the activities of the individual institutions but has no governing authority over them.

### Historical Background

The State of Virginia began its discussions of Compliance with the Civil Rights Act of 1964 with OCR in 1969 and submitted the first version of a PLAN in 1970. A revised plan was submitted and approved in 1974 following the February 1973 correspondence from U.S. OCR. That plan was implemented and operated until the Spring of 1977 when the new Adams' guidelines were published. The second version of the Revised Virginia Plan was accepted in 1978. In January of 1983, OCR requested an extension and amendments in the Revised Plan. The central actors in the development and implementation of "The Virginia Plan for Equal Opportunity in State Supported Institutions of Higher Education" have been Virginia's governors and staff members of the Council of Higher Education.

For this research, the respondents are representatives of the six doctoral granting institutions and the Council of Higher Education. The six institutions are: The University of Virginia, The College of William and Mary, The Virginia Polytechnical Institute and State University, Virginia Commonwealth University, George Mason University, and Old Dominion University. In our description below George Mason University is not treated as it has only recently (1983) become a doctorate granting institution.

Virginia has the greatest number of Ph.D. granting institutions and offers the greatest variety of university settings and hence some unique institutional level responses. Virginia also reflects the greatest amount of administrative decentralization, especially at the campus level and this has some clear implications for their Adams response. Especially with regard to the locational differences among the campuses and their respective adaptation, there are both advantages and disadvantages for the different campuses. We begin with a discussion of the system level response and then identify some campus differences.

Virginia's response to Criterion II-C of the revised guidelines (see Appendix C) currently has four components: The Doctoral Program for Minority Virginians begun in 1977; The Summer Undergraduate Program begun in 1977; Conference for Potential Graduate Students, 1983; and the Graduate Fellowship Program, pilot year 1985-86. Each of these programs is administered by the Council.

Financial Aid

The Doctoral Program for Minority Virginians is for employees of the publicly supported institutions in Virginia. Annually since 1977 the program has supported from seven (7) to nine (9) students. Created through funding from the Virginia General Assembly in 1976, the program has provided stipends ranging between five and eight thousand dollars in 1977 to as much as $9,000 in 1984-85. In addition a stipend of up to $1,300 has been provided for tuition, fees and books. In the initial guidelines the funds were available for one-year of full-time study for qualified minorities. The program, presented in the revised PLANS (1978) was clearly perceived as a key component of the State's Affirmative Action Employment effort (pp. 79-80, Revised State Plans, 1978).

Beginning in 1985-86 the Council will administer a Graduate Fellowship Program targeted for approximately 20 students, each receiving $4,400 fellowships. It is not clear whether this program will continue.

Recruitment and Support Services

The Summer Undergraduate Program, also begun in 1977 is designed to provide an enrichment opportunity for outstanding minority students who are potential candidates for doctoral studies. The students attend a five-week summer program which includes enrollment in one graduate level course, an orientation seminar for careers and issues in higher education and issues related to graduate study. A follow-up conference (The Conference for Potential Graduate Students) is held in the following fall, attended by the prior summer participants, potential students for the following summer and other

interested students. Graduate deans and other academic officials from the various campuses also attend. Traditionally this program has been hosted by Virginia Polytechnical Institute (VPI) and State University or one of the comprehensive traditionally white institutions. For the summer of 1984, the program was also operated at Virginia State University (VSU), a traditionally Black institution. Over fifty percent of the previous participants are reported to have subsequently enrolled in graduate programs in one of the state universities. For the summer of 1984, 70 students participated in the programs at VPI and VSU.

Campus Level Initiatives

Virginia's doctoral granting institutions offer the full range of diversity in terms of geographic location and tradition. They offer very distinct and contrasting histories. The University of Virginia, William and Mary and VPI are the older established universities while Old Dominion University and Virginia Commonwealth are more recent. George Mason is recent among the Ph.D. granting universities. UVa and VPI are both in the picturesque western and southwestern areas of the state with low population densities and mainly rural settings. By contrast William and Mary, VCU and ODU, along with GMU are located in major metropolitan centers or adjacent to them. Finally all but UVa and VPI have easy and very proximate access to Virginia's Historically Black Institutions, public and private, or to HBI's in neighboring states (GMU is within 50 miles of the University of the District of Columbia, Howard University, Coppin State, Bowie State and Morgan State Universities).

These locational features and their respective histories have greatly influenced institutional responses. We take special note here of the program features at Old Dominion University. The graduate dean at Old Dominion has arranged for financial assistance to be provided to part-time black graduate students and reports that this feature has greatly expanded the accessibility of the University to employed blacks who are unable to commit to full-time graduate study. With this mechanism, Old Dominion exceeds its goals for black graduate enrollment.

The funds for part-time graduate study are renewable and their average length is for one academic year. The funds for part time study cover up to nine (9) credit hours currently but were previously limited to six (6). In 1983-84 part time tuition grants supported ten students.

Such a program feature would appear to have special merit as an inducement, especially in the metropolitan areas where there are larger concentrations of potential black candidates for graduate study.

The response of Virginia is two-fold: it has an affirmative action component with support for current employees and a generative component with support for current students. Newly initiated efforts will greatly enhance the number of students supported in Virginia which,until recently, funded the fewest black doctoral candidates.

Virginia's funding is not retentive but is renewable on an annual basis. It is, however, greater in average size than are the comparable awards in the other states. Virginia also funds a more comprehensive range of services from the system level in contrast to

the other states, providing centralized funding for recruitment and support services.

Interviews with Virginia's campus level officials provide insights to two issues worth repeating here: one administrative and one programmatic. Centralized administration at both the campus and state level is very important. Virginia campuses interpreted Adams to mean that they could not extend graduate support to non-residents resulting in several missed opportunities and a smaller availability pool. Moreover, for at least two of the doctoral granting institutions, the responsibilities for administering the services were not clearly delineated. One respondent suggested that a designated officer, reporting directly to the chancellor would improve the administration of the Adams response.

Programmatically, the availability of financial assistance to part-time students at the graduate level is an attractive innovation. Especially for doctoral campuses located in urban/metropolitan areas where blacks with the appropriate credentials and experiences are more concentrated, such a provision would certainly increase the availability pool and could do so without significantly higher costs.

Summary of State Commitments

In this chapter we established the context for the five states in terms of their contribution to black graduate enrollment and to earned doctorates by blacks as well as to describe the systemwide and campus level responses to increasing the production of black doctorates.

The public colleges in these five states are clearly major producers of blacks with educational credentials at each degree level, producing over 9% of all black bachelor degrees and over 7% of all black doctorates as recently as 1981. Among these states, Virginia, Florida and Georgia produce the larger supply of bachelor degrees earned by blacks and the same is true at the doctoral level. These figures offer sufficient evidence of the importance of the role of public colleges and universities in these states.

The broad responses of the five states to Adams show conceptual, financial, and administrative differences which we have described. Briefly, the program responses differ conceptually in their relative emphasis on increasing the production of black doctorates for affirmative action employment purposes as oppossed to a more general need to improve the supply. Arkansas and Oklahoma are more clearly affirmative in their structure, while Florida and Virginia are mixed.

Financially, only one of the States has constructed its aid in a retentive fashion--Oklahoma, for up to four years--while the remaining states are offering renewable aid. It is important that the latter avoid the potential "revolving door" possibilities of such aid packages.

Finally, the campus level administrative structures differ greatly. Considerable benefits in communications, service delivery, program development and program execution appear to occur with greater centralization at both the campus and state level. This seems true despite the need to honor departmental autonomy in recruitment and admissions policies at the doctoral level.

In the next chapter we summarize our findings on overall funding, graduate enrollment and degree production for the public doctoral granting institutions in these five states.

## Chapter 4

## Results

Having presented a brief historical overview and description of key activities for each state, we provide a summary of our findings for the five states. The summary findings which follow are a compilation and synthesis of data derived from our interviews in each state and from compiled data. Where necessary, the source of our data is indicated. We begin with our core concern, the effectiveness of state financial aid in the production of black Ph.D.'s.

For the purpose of this research three indicators were used to assess the effectiveness of financial aid:

1) Has the aid produced an increase in the number of doctorates awarded to blacks?

2) Is the increase in aid availability reflected in increasing rates of first-time black graduate enrollees?

3) Does the quality of the aid, as indicated by amount, length of award, type of award (i.e. fellowship, assistantship or some combination), suggest that it is sufficient?

Each of these indicators is addressed below using both the secondary data and interview data. First, the Adams states are committed to achieving parity with respect to access at the graduate level measured as equal percentages of black and white in-state bachelor degree recipients from public institutions who enroll in graduate school in the following year. In general, these states approached but did not attain parity on this measure on a consistent basis. The January 1983 letter of evaluation to the respective state governors reveals that, with the exception of Virginia, no state achieved parity on this measure for the period 1979-80 through 1980-81 and 1981-82. Thus, with respect to this standard measure of equity,

progress was minimal. Similarly, the elimination of black/white disparity with respect to degree attainment at the doctoral level has not been achieved.*

Tables 3 and 4 provide data on black degree attainment at the doctoral level and first-time graduate enrollment for each of the five states beginning in 1976. We begin with a discussion of Table 3.

If "effectiveness" is indicated by an increase in the number of black Ph.D.'s produced, based on the figures of Table 3, the efforts of the Adams states individually and collectively did not achieve hoped-for success. As shown in Table 3 only two states (Arkansas and Virginia) awarded more Ph.D.'s to blacks in 1983-84 than they awarded eight years earlier in 1975-76, approximately two years before plan implementation in 1978. Even these differences were minimal (1 and 2 respectively) while the decreases for Georgia and Oklahoma, comparing the two time points were slightly greater--4 and 5 respectively--about fifty percent fewer than eight years earlier for Oklahoma. Similarly, the totals for these five states show that for 1983-84 these states produced 78 black Ph.D.'s, six fewer than eight years earlier.

---

*See Tables 1-10 and 11-20 (Appendix D) for the actual counts and percentages of enrollment and degree attainment by race and ethnicity for each state. The tables include the earned degrees for the bachelors through the professional degree.

TABLE 3

Black Ph.D. Degree Attainment for Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Oklahoma, and Virginia

| | 1975-76 [1] | 1976-77 [1] | 1978-79 [1] | 1979-80 [2] | 1980-81 [1] | 1981-82 [2] | 1982-83 [2] | 1983-84 [2] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Arkansas | 5 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| Florida | 36 | 39 | 27 | 26 | 34 | 28 | 30 | 36 |
| Georgia | 18 | 10 | 20 | 14 | 20 | 18 | 12 | 14 |
| Oklahoma | 10 | 6 | 22 | 7 | 11 | 11 | 13 | 5 |
| Virginia | 15 | 18 | 27 | 16 | 19 | 24 | 23 | 17 |
| TOTALS | 84 | 76 | 100 | 68 | 87 | 87 | 84 | 78 |

1. Earned Degree data for 1975-76, 1976-77, 1978-79, and 1980-81 are based on data from the Higher Education General Information Survey of degrees and other formal awards confirmed between July 1 and June 30 of the respective years (HEGIS XI, XII, XIV, AND XVI).

2. Earned Degree data reported for 1979-80, 1981-82, 1982-83, and 1983-84 are based on Annual Reports supplied by the state systemwide offices.

In addition to the above comparison, perhaps the more accurate and more revealing description of the patterns in Table 3 is the year-to-year fluctuations that occur for each state: there are no clear trends in the data for any one state or across the states. At best, the years 1980-81 to 1982-83 would appear to be relatively stable overall and for each state except Georgia. It could be suggested, based on the degree attainment figures, that the post-Plan implementation period has offered no substantial improvements over the pre-Plan period. In essence, the availability of a statewide program has not discernibly altered the number of black recipients of the doctorate at public institutions in these states. It appears that rather than increasing the number of students aided, the new sources of aid are being used by the same numbers of students.

A second indication of "effectiveness of state financial aid" is increased enrollment. That is, if increased amounts and sources of financial support are available, the expectation would be increases in the number of first-time black graduate students enrolled. The lack of financial support is cited as a major barrier to continuing one's schooling, especially for blacks (Copeland, 1984; Thomas, 1985). Table 4 presents the first-time black graduate enrollment figures for 1976 through 1984.

The numbers in Table 4 show a similar pattern of unevenness as is true for the degree attainment table. It is clear, however, that the reported figures for 1983 and 1984 are differently compiled

TABLE 4

First-Time Graduate Enrollment for Black Students in Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Oklahoma, and Virginia[1]

| | 1976[2] | 1978[2] | 1980[2] | 1982[2] | 1983[3] | 1984[3] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Arkansas | 86 | 102 | 79 | 40 | 106 | 131 |
| Florida | 204 | 238 | 278 | 226 | - | 115 |
| Georgia | 488 | 554 | 334 | 309 | 144 | 136 |
| Oklahoma | 116 | 109 | 97 | 72 | 137 | 145 |
| Virginia | 263 | 215 | 277 | 215 | 164 | 230 |
| TOTALS | 1157 | 1218 | 1065 | 862 | | 757 |

1. The enrollment data reported in this table is given only for those four-year institutions in each state that awards the doctorate degree.

2. First-time black graduate enrollments for 1976, 1978, 1980 and 1982 are based on data from the Higher Education General Information Surveys of Fall Enrollment, public use data tapes for the respective years (HEGIS XI, XIII, XV, and XVII).

3. First-time black graduate enrollments for 1983 and 1984 are based on reports from the state system offices for each of the five states.

compared to the prior years reported. Taking Arkansas and Oklahoma as exceptions, we do see evidence of considerable improvements for 1983 and 1984. Nonetheless, using only the 1976 to 1982 years (based on HEGIS public use data tapes) it is readily apparent that the overall movement in black first-time graduate enrollment is downward. Here, the first year of plan implementation, 1978, is the year of highest first-time black graduate enrollment overall. By 1982 the overall enrollment figure is about 30% lower. Note also that 1978-79 was the year when the greatest number of doctorates was awarded to blacks. It is likely that increased sources or amounts of financial aid could have influenced both degree attainment and enrollment in that first year of full implementation especially in the limited case where near-Ph.D.'s were assisted to completion in one year. As we shall see below, that is not a remote possibility for Oklahoma and Virginia, the two states showing the largest increases in Ph.D.'s awarded to blacks from 1976-77 to 1978-79.

It is still the case, however, that the enrollment figures do not reflect a general pattern of change which would suggest that increases in financial aid have been effective in increasing the pool of black candidates for the doctorate. First-time graduate enrollment figures include those who will terminate with a Master's degree and in some fields there are strong financial incentives for doing so. On the other hand, the quality of direct aid available could increase the number of black students who will persist to the doctorate. In that case, the first-time black graduate enrollment numbers, while not increasing, could contain a greater proportion of

aspirants for the doctorate. A third factor related to increased access is the quality of financial support.

Table 5 summarizes the states' current efforts in providing financial assistance to black doctoral students. In addition, it provides an indication of the availability of state provided funding for recruitment, and other supportive services. It is important to emphasize that the monies reported here are those state funds which are clearly designated for the support of black graduate doctoral candidates and are centrally administered. The figures in the table do not represent the total sum of support made available by individual institutions, some of which may be provided by states and may be awarded to black graduate students. The reported monies represent funds made available through legislative action in response to Adams. We note here that for Arkansas, 1985-86 was the first year of implementation of such support.

For the average size of awards (column 1), the number of students supported (column 2 - FTE) and total (column 3), there are considerable differences from one state to the next. For the average dollar amounts, Florida (1), Georgia and Oklahoma are quite comparable, offering grants of five to six thousand dollars annually. By contrast, Virginia offers an average award of ten to twelve thousand to qualified employees comparable to Florida's (2) response, the Employee Grant-in-Aid Program. As we suggested earlier, some states have made explicit their intentions to use the support of doctoral candidates as an aid to their affirmative action promotion

Table 5

Characteristics of Systemwide State Financial Aid for
Black Doctoral/Graduate Students in Selected ADAMS States

| STATE | FUNDING | | | | | RECRUITMENT | | SUPPORT SERVICES |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Ave. | FTE | Total $ | Length | Additive | Funded | Centralized | Funded |
| Arkansas | - | - | $175,000 | N/A | Yes | - | - | - |
| Florida (1) | $5,000 | 63 | 315,000 | Rnwble | Yes | No | No | Yes |
| (2) | 17,000 | 10 | 170,000 | Rnwble | | | | |
| Georgia | 5,000 | 120 | 600,000 | Rnwble | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| Oklahoma | 6,000 | 20 | 120,000 | 4 years | Yes | No | No | No |
| Virginia | 10,000-12,000 | 7-10 | 100,000 | Rnwble | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

and hiring policies. In Virginia, Florida and Oklahoma, these intentions are quite clear. The newly implemented response from Arkansas is tailored in the same fashion.

Georgia and Florida are clearly supporting the greater numbers of students, perhaps reflecting their states' black population concentrations. Such is not the case in Virginia which also has a substantial black population but currently shows the smallest dollar amount and lowest number of students supported. The stipends for Virginia and Florida (2) are attractive and do not preclude other income (see Florida Desegregation Plan in Chapter II). These employee grant programs are renewable for at least one additional year in both Virginia and Florida and each carries a reciprocity work agreement based on leave time used. Each of these awards also includes a tuition payment, further enhancing the sufficiency of the award.

For the Florida (1), Georgia and Oklahoma grant programs, their stipend quality is enhanced because they are additive, used in conjunction with other forms of aid. For Oklahoma, the "packaging" of aid has been made quite explicit (see Oklahoma Desegregation Plan, Chapter II) and the resulting aid awards can total up to $16,000 per year. For Florida, the grant program is renewable but the emphasis is on new students with other institutional support coming into play in subsequent years. By contrast, Oklahoma has followed a consistent plan of increasing the length of time a student may hold the award, from two years at its inception to the current four years. In each of the other states, the candidates who currently hold the awards are eligible to reapply but the aid is not guaranteed. In this sense,

only in Oklahoma can the grants be considered retentive. It should be noted, however, that this plan has been proposed in Florida but to date has not been implemented.

Finally, the reader should be reminded that the total amounts reported in Table 5 are annual, not cumulative. That is, new and continuing grantees are annually competing for a fixed amount of dollars, even in Oklahoma where such funds are retentive in practice. Two outcomes are potential here. First, the grant program could have "revolving door" impact if other aid sources such as departmentally awarded assistantships and waivers of tuition are not forthcoming or are insufficient. Second, such an arrangement could encourage increased emphasis on "picking the best horse." In the first instance one long-term possibility could be that students come to view the aid as less of an opportunity and more of a risk. Certainly it could increase the stress resulting from the need for competitive performance. In the second instance, an emphasis on selection might tend to perpetuate rigid adherence to traditional admissions criteria, especially test scores. This could have the effect of not increasing the candidate pool and hence not increasing production.

In general, we find the aid programs of good quality on each of our indicators except length. It is important that states thoroughly examine the orientation taken by Oklahoma and increasingly view and structure their grant programs as retentive. Beyond that, numbers (FTE) appear low in Virginia and Oklahoma and likely low in Arkansas. In both Oklahoma and Virginia this concern is being addressed. The Oklahoma Regents have made repeated requests for increases but it has not been forthcoming. Similarly, Virginia has made repeated requests

but with somewhat greater success. Beginning in 1985-86, the Council for Higher Education will administer a new pilot program, the Graduate Fellowship Program, offering a one-time, one-year graduate fellowship totaling $4,400 to twenty-two students. Hopefully this effort will be continued and increased.

## Recruitment and Support Services

In our proposal we suggested that, in addition to direct aid to black graduate students, an effective response should entail funded recruitment and support services for these students. In general, as Table 3 shows, only one state scores well on each of these measures while one other funds support services. Here we briefly describe the nature and funding of the services.

Briefly, only Virginia directly funds their recruitment effort. Annually, the current funding is at $100,000 and provides for two services. The first is an annual workshop for potential graduate students who are currently enrolled as juniors in the states' public colleges. These workshops are attended by the deans and other academic officials representing the state's doctorate granting institutions. A second program, the Summer Undergraduate Program and Doctoral Program for Minority Virginians, is annually held providing undergraduates the opportunity to take one graduate course and receive an orientation to graduate work during the summer.

Florida currently provides $342,000 to fund a special summer program for new, entering graduate and professional students. Each student receives a grant ranging from $1,300 to $1,500 to help defray the cost of tuition and living expenses.

While differently focused, each of these efforts seems quite appropriate based on the earlier cited studies by Peterson et al. (1978) and Blackwell (1981). These recruitment and support activities serve the purpose of stimulating interest in, increasing familiarity with and communicating the interest of the state and university in the students.

Summary

In summary here, we repeat the main findings. The pattern of earned doctorates for blacks in these states is uneven with no clearly discernible trend for any one state or overall. The 1983-84 degree count is lower but virtually no different from the 1975-76 count. Using an average of four to five years for degree completion, it is reasonable to expect changes as early as 1982-83 and certainly by 1983-84 in each of these states except for Arkansas. That this is not the case raises at least two possible interpretations. First, the 1975-76 degree count level may already reflect significant increases in each of these states and, hence, looking for further increments is likely to be disappointing. This may be likely but the funding levels reported here were initiated after 1975-76 and should show some impact. This suggests a second interpretation raised earlier, that perhaps these funds are being used as replacement funds, instead of loans or work. Still, however, it will be difficult to account for these low degree count levels given the numbers being supported in Florida and Georgia. The alternative suggestion that the grants are being used disproportionately for professional students is not borne out either. In Florida, for example, of sixty-six students supported as of fall 1983, nineteen

were reported enrolled in professional programs compared to forty-seven in traditional graduate fields leading to the doctorate.

The first-time black graduate enrollment rates underscore the nature of the impact or lack thereof. The decline over the six year period from 1976 to 1982 which exists for each state and overall, is significant. Table 6 underscores the twelve year pattern of national black graduate enrollment from 1972 to 1984. As shown, both in real numbers and as a percentage of all graduate students, blacks have experienced a precipitous decrease. Indeed, since 1980 there has been a 4000 student decline. Inasmuch as the observed patterns in these Adams states correspond to national trends, it forces us to reconsider ways of increasing the candidate pool.

The quality of direct aid being supplied by the states appears adequate on all but one of our criteria; its retentiveness. It is important that students have a sense of certainty about their financial support in order to maximize their planning and pursuit of graduate training. As was repeatedly expressed by our respondents, the emphasis has been on new students, probably attributable to a concern for improving black/white parity in enrollment. Obviously both goals are important but the consequences of their current tensions could render the programs less effective.

TABLE 6
Black Full-Time Graduate Enrollment:
Even Years, 1972 to 1984

| Fall of Year | Full-time Graduate Students* | |
|---|---|---|
| | Black Students (in thousands) | Blacks as a Percent of All Students |
| 1972 | 21 | 5.3 |
| 1974 | 22 | 5.5 |
| 1976 | 22 | 5.1 |
| 1978 | 21 | 4.9 |
| 1980 | 22 | 5.0 |
| 1982 | 19 | 4.2 |
| 1984 | 18 | 3.9 |

*Excludes (1) unclassified students (i.e., not candidates for a degree and (2) students in U.S. Service Schools.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, School Enrollment - Social Economic Characteristics of Students, Series P-20, Nos. 222, 303, 362, and 404.

## Chapter 5

## Recommendations

The purpose of this research was to assess the effectiveness of state financial aid in increasing the production of Black doctoral recipients. As the quantitative assessment revealed, the efforts of the states have been meaningful but are generally not sufficient with respect to retention. In addition, our interviews with state and campus representatives identified several practices which we feel should be encouraged. Below we offer recommendations covering four areas: Financial Aid; Recruitment; Support Services; and Administration.

### Financial Aid

o Improve the quantity and quality of aid.

Not surprisingly, we find the number of students assisted and the overall quality of aid offered lacking. Only two states have provisions for doctoral grants to more than twenty students (Florida [73] and Georgia [120]). Arkansas, should it follow the award pattern of the other states which average about $5,000,could assist as many as 35 students. On the other hand it could assist no more than 10 with an average award of $17,500. It should also be noted that those states offering the greater number of awards are not restricting the support solely to graduate students but also assist professional students. The immediate way to increase the numbers of students supported would be to treat the monies as retentive and as aid which increases enrollment. Simply stated each award should be for a specified period and the same number of awards should be given annually. Thus a current arrangement for

supporting 20 students would be cumulative to 80 in the fourth year.

o Improve the quality of aid to black graduate students.

We recommend that aid be retentive. While we appreciate the needs of these states to show increases in enrollment, we feel that such a practice could eventuate in a revolving door experience as has been true of undergraduate programs that have not attended to retention activities in a comprehensive way. We suggest that it is even more important for graduate students to be able to plan their financial support well beyond the first year. The academic reasons for this recommendation seem obvious but in the case of black graduate students there are additional reasons. Traditionally the largest pool of black graduate candidates has been those who have delayed entry well beyond the year following undergraduate graduation for any number of reasons, including cost. In order to close the black-white gap in doctorate degree attainment it will be necessary to continue to recruit from this pool. Candidates from this pool present a broader range of financial obligations and hence greater need as well as a greater need for financial stability over the graduate years.

o Improve the quality of aid by increasing/supplementing awards.

This research did not interview graduate students and therefore cannot document the sufficiency of the awards from the students' perspective. However, we are impressed by the Oklahoma plan which has improved the adequacy of its awards by requiring supplementary support from the institutions enrolling the student. As a result the ensuing tax breaks increase the net amounts received by the

graduate students. However the unclear situation regarding the taxation of graduate fellowships and assistantships as well as tuition waivers at the federal level may dilute support already being provided.

Consideration must also be given to demographical data on the black person now enrolled in doctoral programs both locally and nationally. For example, the average age of black persons completing the doctorate is 38, compared to age 33 for their white cohorts. In 1985 at the national level, 53 percent of those blacks receiving the doctorate degree were women. The level of support necessary to pursue the degree is greatly influenced by the age and circumstance of those pursuing the degree. The implication here is that these female students who are older may have greater financial obligations and be required to combine work and school.

Finally, with respect to financial aid, we recommend the following strategies:

- **Target financial aid to support students in specific graduate programs in order to compete with highly attractive employment opportunities.** The Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC) Fellowship Program implemented by the participating BIG TEN universities and the University of Chicago and the McKnight Fellowship Program recently established by the State of Florida with funds from the McKnight Foundation are two such examples where the aid is targeted for the doctorate. These programs offer relatively attractive financial support and continue support beyond the

first year. The McKnight Program has also successfully utilized industry to supplement available financial aid.

- **Consider extending aid to part-time black graduate students.** We were very impressed with the successes of this effort at Old Dominion University in Virginia. Especially for those campuses located in urban areas and where evening programs are a part of the graduate curriculum, potential black graduate students might find continued pursuit of the doctorate more accessible. Urban areas contain the greatest concentrations of blacks with the academic credentials to pursue the terminal doctorate. At the same time these potential graduate students face larger financial obligations which inhibit their prospects for full-time study. We recognize that such a plan departs in substantial ways from the traditional conceptualization of doctoral study but suggest that the feasibility of such an arrangement be carefully explored. The recently established Illinois Consortium for Educational Opportunity Program (ICEOP) by the State of Illinois supports both full-time and part-time students. One possibility is to require one-year of full-time resident study at a latter stage of the doctoral program.

Recruitment and Retention

o Improve the recruitment effort with an emphasis on expanding the pool of candidates.

Recruiting efforts must be expanded to increase the pool of students who are interested in pursuing advanced graduate degrees.

- **State funding for recruitment activities should be implemented or increased.** The plan utilized by the University of Florida which entailed the involvement of faculty and current graduate students as recruiters, along with an intense focus on the Historically Black Institutions (HBI) was the most attractive recruitment effort about which we obtained information. Historically Black Institutions generally have the largest concentrations of potential applicants and the involvement of faculty in the recruitment effort communicates a high level of commitment from the recruiting institution.
- **More isolated institutions should be supported in developing cooperative programs with Historically Black Institutions whereby students from HBIs spend one or more years studying on the Historically White Institutions(HWI) campuses during the undergraduate years.** Many of the non-urban campuses and those lacking either the high national visibility or culturally rich and diverse local environment viewed as conducive to blacks, report that overcoming those obstacles is quite difficult. Such an effort might serve to generate both a better known and better informed pool of black graduate students. A likely indirect effect might be early socialization into a discipline/field of concentration. Programs such as Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC), Summer Research Opportunity Program (SROP) and the Minority Access to Research Careers (MARC), designed to introduce research to minority undergraduates, should be

implemented or expanded. It is essential that institutions of higher learning simply not engage in competing for the same students but develop and implement programs to increase the dwindling pool.

We view these recommendations as enhancements of existing efforts focusing on current undergraduates--summer programs, special recruitment workshops, etc.--and suggest that planning is probably a key to better recruitment. For example, Virginia institutions now share a listing of current undergraduate enrollees who are potential black graduate students. This feature of their recruitment effort demonstrates the way in which existing resources can be better utilized with effective planning.

Support Services

o Improve the provision for tutorial services, counseling/advising, mentoring and socialization into the doctoral discipline or field of study.

- **No state office reported specific funding for academic support beyond a summer program (Florida and Virginia).** Tutorial services were either provided by the student's department or were provided through the program coordinator's office. State assistance for such services could increase both the availability and utilization of such services.
- **Funding should be available to support and encourage mentoring and professional socialization.** A consistent problem for minorities and women at the graduate level (and in the professional areas also) has been the availability of

mentors and a concurrent problem of identifying faculty advisors who provide academic advising and psychological support.

We are impressed with the activities of the Oklahoma regents to provide special monies to encourage mentor relationships and to support conference attendance and other special involvements for doctoral students. Obtaining the doctorate entails more than completing the formal requirements prerequisite to initiating and sustaining an academic career. It is also critical that one acquires an appreciation for the standards and traditions for work in his field and these are often acquired through effective tutelage and involvement. The involvement may come with membership and participation in regional and national professional association for the candidates substantive area.

Administration

o Improve the administration of the activities aimed at increasing the production of Black doctorates.

- **We find a variety of delivery systems in place across the five states and on the individual campuses.** Even where central state offices exhibit effective administration, there can be campus level breakdowns. Moreover campus level administrators each acknowledge the importance (if not the sanctity) of departmental autonomy at the doctoral level with respect to recruitment, admission and retention. Given these latter considerations, we recommend no single design as best but offer the following general and specific recommendations:

- **Centralize campus-level administrative responsibility and authority.** It is essential to designate a person who has clear authority to develop and implement programs. Preferably a minority administrator/academician should assume this position.
- **The campus-level administrator should report to the campus chief academic/administrative officer.** The second and third recommendations above are intended to amplify the need for clearly communicating the institutional intent and commitment both internally and to outside audiences. In most instance, many of these arrangements currently exist in the states examined.
- **Improve the management and reporting of program data.** While the Office for Civil Rights, Department of Education, requires specific data elements, we find one omission quite glaring: the specific form and amount of aid to graduate students by race, gender and ethnicity is not required as a separate entry as is enrollment. As a consequence, such data are difficult to accumulate in sufficient quantity or quality for trend analyses or for parity comparisons. Also, while most campuses and state offices produce annual reports, they vary between states and campuses and in some (rarely) instances are inconsistent over time. Further standardizing and elaborating the report procedures for doctoral/graduate level students should enhance both the internal and external understanding of and communications about the programs.

- **Communicate clearly the dimensions of the services.** It is vital that all appropriate state and campus level officials know the provisions of the program. One state, for example, was not clear on whether or not out-of-state students were eligible.

  Finally, on most campuses at least four positions are involved in the administrative/decision flow for these programs: the Affirmative Action Officer; Graduate Dean; Financial Aid Officer and the Graduate Admissions Officer. In most instances either the Affirmative Action Officer or Graduate Dean (or his assistant) had primary responsibility/authority for the program. However, only in two instances did we experience a campus where one officer had comprehensive data. While this may not be a critical problem, it does reflect the need for centralization and clear and regular communications. Such changes should enhance the operation and subsequent achievements of the programmatic efforts.

o Expand the availability of state supported doctoral programs at Historically Black Institutions.

This recommendation follows only indirectly from the research reported here. During the period covered in this report, only one Historically Black Institution offered the doctorate in any field (Florida A and M in Pharmacy with three (3) doctorates reported awarded in 1980-81).

Research has consistently shown that HBIs continue to award a substantial proportion of the degrees awarded to blacks at each

degree level and even more so in high demand areas like medicine, law and the biological sciences at the first professional and doctoral levels. It seems most appropriate to capitalize on this history of success and to do so under the aegis of Adams which specifically calls for the enhancement of the HBIs in these states. Even granting major consideration to avoiding program duplication does not prevent a more thorough assessment of the efficacy of expanding existing graduate level programs at HBIs to doctoral status.

The above recommendations grow out of findings in this research effort along with our sense of what the literature suggests regarding educational opportunity programs, minority graduate students and effective administration. We are not suggesting that each state and each campus must respond to each recommendation but rather that each of the states and campuses could profitably respond to one or more of the recommendations. We also recognize that our recommendations regarding financial aid are made at a time when the effects of retrenchment and Gramm-Rudmann are both exacting substantial tolls on state and campus level resources which greatly constrain responses to recommendations on the quantity and quality of aid. At the same time, those same constraints make it doubly important that the financial support of black graduate/doctoral students be enhanced. Indeed those constraints are likely to have far more serious negative consequences on the decisions of blacks to pursue doctoral studies without a clear base of adequate support.

## Conclusion

In conclusion, the efforts of the five states reported here, to increase the production of Black doctorate recipients, have improved in considerable ways since their inception. Nevertheless, the net result of these programs after six years of operation has to be considered minimal if our criteria are (a) an increase in the number of Black Ph.D.'s produced or (b) an increase in first-time black graduate enrollment. In both cases the total 1983-84 counts are lower than both the 1978-79 counts and the 1975-76 counts, the latter being two years prior to plan acceptance. As is clear from national data, there has been a precipitous decline in Black participation in graduate education since the latter half of the 1970s. Even in those instances such as Adams, where legal decisions have required improvements, the evidence indicates that successes have not been forthcoming. It is imperative that efforts to bring about improvements be redoubled.

## REFERENCES

Astin, Alexander W. Minorities in American Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1982.

Blackwell, James E. Access of Black Students to Graduate and Professional Schools. Atlanta, GA: Southern Education Foundation, 1975.

Blackwell, James E. Mainstreaming Outsiders: The Production of Black Professionals. New York: General Hall Publishing Co., 1981.

Boyd, William M., II. Desegregating America's Colleges: A Nationwide Survey of Black Students, 1972-73. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1974.

Brown, Frank and Madelon D. Stent. Minorities in U.S. Institutions of Higher Education. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1977.

Copeland, Elaine J. "Trends in Black Participation in Graduate Education: Barriers to Access, Possible Alternatives." Paper presented at the second national conference on issues facing black administrators at predominantly white colleges and universities. Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1984.

_____ The Effects of Major Socioeconomic Factors on Black Graduate Student Enrollment: A Trend Analysis, 1967-1985, 1986, unpublished manuscript.

Ford Foundation. "A Survey of Black American Doctorates." Ford Foundation, Office of Reports, New York, NY, 1970.

Haynes, L.L. A Critical Examination of the Adams Case: A Source Book. Washington, D.C.: Institute for Services to Education, 1978.

Haynes, L.L. (Ed.). An Analysis of the Arkansas - Georgia Statewide Desegregation Plans. Washington, D.C.: Institute for Services to Education, 1979.

Institute for the Study of Educational Policy. Equal Education Opportunity Scoreboard: The Status of Black Americans in Higher Education, 1970-79. Washington, D.C.: Howard University Press, 1981.

Mingle, James R. Black Enrollment in Higher Education: Trends in the Nation and the South. Research Report, Southern Regional Education Board, 1978.

Morris, Lorenzo, Elusive Equality. Washington, D.C.: Howard University Press, 1979.

National Advisory Committee on Black Higher Education and Black Colleges and Universities. A Loosing Battle: The Decline in Black Participation in Graduate and Professional Education. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, 1980.

National Board on Graduate Education. Minority Group Participation in Graduate Education. Washington, D.C., 1976.

National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). Higher Education General Information Survey of Earned Degrees. Washington, D.C.: Department of Education, 1975-76, 1980-81, unpublished data.

National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). Higher Education General Information Survey of Fall Enrollment in Colleges and Universities, 1976, 1978, 1980, 1982. Washington, D.C.: Department of Education, 1982, unpublished data.

National Research Council. Doctorate Recipients from United States Universities. Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences, 1982.

Peterson, Marvin W., Robert T. Blackburn, Zelda F. Gamson, Carlos H. Arce, Roselle W. Davenport, and James R. Mingle. Black Students on White Campuses: The Impacts of Increased Black Enrollments. Ann Arbor, MI: The Institute for Social Research, Univ. of Michigan, 1978.

Rockefeller Foundation. "Bakke, Weber and Affirmative Action." A Rockefeller Foundation Conference, The Rockefeller Foundation, July 12-13, 1979.

Thomas, Gail. The Access and Success of Blacks and Hispanics in U.S. Graduate and Professional Education. Office of Scientific and Engineering Personnel, National Research Council, National Academy Press, Washington, D.C., 1986.

Trent, William T. "Equity Considerations in Higher Education: Race and Sex Differences in Degree Attainment and Major Field from 1975-76 through 1980-81. American Journal of Education, Vol. 92, No. 3, May 1984.

_____ "Comparisons of Race and Gender Degree Attainment in 1975-76 and 1980-81: A Focus on Equity." Paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the Southern Sociological Society, April 1984.

Wright, Stephen J. "Redressing the Imbalance of Minority Groups in the Professions." Journal of Higher Education 93:3 (March 1972), pp. 239-248.

# Appendix A

## Interview Schedule

**Cover Sheet**

Interviewer _____

Respondent: Name _____ State _____

Position _____

Date _____

Time: Begin _____ End _____

**Effectiveness of State Financial Aid in the Production of Black Doctoral Recipients**

Co-Principals: Elaine Copeland
Associate Dean
Graduate College Admininstration
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
107 Coble Hall
(217) 333-4860

William T. Trent
Assistant Professor
Sociology of Education
Department of Educational Policy Studies
368 Education Building
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
1310 South Sixth Street
(217) 333-6153

I'd like to begin with some basic data on what you see your state and its senior institutions accomplishing in response to the Adam's mandate regarding increasing the number of black doctoral degree holders.

1) Tell me about this state's response, beginning with the planning phase following acceptance of your plan by OCR. First, how many years has the effort been in effect?

a) What state/university officials were involved in the planning and development?

b) How many months/years did the planning phase last?

c) What were the key issues raised during the planning phase?
i) How did you secure the cooperation of the various academic departments? Was this a major obstacle?

ii) How did you treat the issue of departmental/campus autonomy? Was this a major obstacle?

iii) How did you treat the issues of identifying/recruiting candidates? Was this a major obstacle?

iv) How was the cost issue treated? How were initial estimates of cost arrived at?

d) What were the categories of cost; what did you foresee spending money for in this effort?

e) Please rate the success of the planning phase? 1) very unsuccessful; 2) unsuccessful; 3) successful; 4) very successful

_____

_____

i) Please explain your rating of the planning phase.

_____

_____

_____

2) Please assess implementation? Would you say it was: 1) very difficult; 2) difficult; 3) smooth; 4) very smooth.

_____

_____

a) If 1) or 2) then what have been the key problems? Would you rank them please?

_____

_____

b) In the beginning, were all of your doctoral granting campuses enrolling about the same number of black graduate students?

_____

_____

_____

If "no", then:
i) For those campuses that were enrolling more, were their experiences especially informative?, and, in what ways?

_____

_____

_____

c) What were the steps taken to implement the state's response (i.e., first we identified a central coordination, or, first we sent a special letter to all Deans and department chairs, and then.....etc.).

_____

_____

d) Do you feel that the state is beyond the implementation phase? If not, what remains?

_____

_____

As our letter of introduction explained we are particularly concerned to identify systematic program services in an effort to help us better understand how an increase in the number of black Ph.D.'s can be successfully approached. I'd like to turn now to a discussion of specific features of your program.

**Financial Assistance**

A. Aid Opportunities (Use Form A for your responses please.)

1. Using the list on Form "A", please identify the specific types of state allocated aid (grants, scholarships, fellowships, loans, etc.) available to black doctoral level degree work and the date of implementation (Col. 1). What others?
2. How long (in years) are these available to each recipient (e.g., 1 year renewable, 3, 4, or 5 years, etc.). (Col. 2)
3. For each type of aid identified above give the current number of users (1983-84). (Col. 3) What will be the number of users in 1984-85? (Col. 1) How many past users have there been? (Col. 5) What is the maximum dollar amount available to a recipient each year? (Col. 6) What is the total dollar amount allocated by the state for each aid type in 1984-85? (Col. 7) Is this an increase or decrease from last year? (Col. 8) How much? (Col. 9)
4. For each type of aid identified in "1" above, please give its planned funding level for the next budget year. (Col. 10)
5. For each type of aid identified in "1" above, please indicate whether or not it can be used in conjunction with another or in conjunction with other sources of aid. (Col. 11; 1 = yes; 0 = no)
6. Please indicate for each form of aid in "1" above the limitations on residency and citizenship that govern the awards. (Col. 12 of Form A)

7. Please provide below an example(s) of typical state funded financial aid "packages" for black doctoral students.
8. Please list and give the dollar amount of non-state (private) revenues that serve as either matching or independent aid set aside for black doctoral candidates. (Use Form A, part 2)

_____

_____

_____

_____

**Aid Process and Quality**

B. Next let's talk about the "process" of securing and the "quality" of the aid.

First, we are aware that, in many instances, doctoral applicants usually correspond mainly with their anticipated major field department and subsequently with the graduate programs office/officer. Could you please tell me about this process in this state, especially as it pertains to Adams considerations.

1. What are the criteria for a black graduate student to be countable as a response to your Adams mission?

_____

_____

_____

2. Please describe in detail the application procedure for consideration for financial aid.

   a) How are applications for aid consideration made available to potential doctoral candidates?

_____

_____

_____

_____

   b) Are applications available on request only?

_____

_____

c) What university/state positions review and act on applications?

_____

_____

3. Please describe any "formula" used in the determination of aid awards by defining formula components (e.g., income levels, dependents and any special considerations).

_____

_____

_____

_____

4. Please describe the direct and indirect education costs that state provided aid will cover (tuition, books, fees, housing, dissertation research, and stipends or conference attendance, professional association dues, etc.).

_____

_____

_____

_____

5. Can state monies be used by blacks to matriculate from private institutions at the doctoral level?
Yes _____
No _____

**Recruitment**

1. How are potential black doctoral candidates identified?

_____

_____

_____

_____

2. What specific practices are employed to inform blacks in four-year-only state institutions of doctoral program opportunities available in senior state colleges and universities?

3. Does the state currently provide for specifically post-baccalaureate minority recruitment efforts?

   a) In what year was this funding initiated?

   b) What dollar amount was available in the first year for those activities?

   c) What is the current dollar amount available for the current year?

4. Is there an office or officer responsible for coordination or administration of recruitment activities (for black doctoral study)?

5. Do black faculty and administrators participate in the recruitment process.

6. Often there are blacks in teaching or administrative positions who do not have the terminal academic degree but who represent an immediate pool of doctoral candidates. Do these persons constitute a separate pool for recruitment?

7. What recommendations would you have for improving the recruitment activities?

8. Please describe the components of the "admission to graduate study" decision. If possible please rank these in their order of importance.

**Support Services**

1. Please list the range of support services designated to sustain the matriculation of black doctoral candidates.

a) What retention activities are funded by the state for the specific purpose of sustaining the enrollment of black graduate students (i.e., pre-enrollment academic services, post-enrollment academic services, special courses, workshops or training).

i) What dollar amount is currently available for these activities?

ii) Is this an increase or decrease over prior years?

iii) In what year were these services initiated?

b) What retention activities make use of university based services not funded as a special component of a desegregation program (i.e., writing or other skills labs, counseling, etc.).

2. Please give the number of students utilizing each of the services above for the past year.

3. Please rate the effectiveness of the support services listed above from least effective to most effective (1 2 3 4). (The criterion for effectiveness may be the level of demand for the service or an assessment based on a formal evaluation you are personally aware of. If there is a formal evaluation of any of the services, may we please have a copy of that report?)

4. Finally could I please obtain from you a copy of reports giving counts for the following:

a) Number of applicants for doctoral study by year and campus since acceptance of your plans by OCR.

b) Number of black applicants for doctoral study by year and campus since acceptance of your plans by OCR.

c) Number of acceptances for doctoral study by year and campus since acceptance of your plans by OCR.

d) Number of black acceptances for doctoral study by year and campus since acceptance of your plans by OCR.

e) Number of enrollees for doctoral study by year and campus since acceptance of your plans by OCR.

f) Number of black enrollees for doctoral study by year and campus since acceptance of your plans by OCR.

Form "A" - Please use with Items 1-8 on Pages 3 and 4

| Financial Aid Item 1: Check(✓) each type of State aid available | Item 2: What was the date of initial funding | Item 2: What is the average length of this award? | Item 3: How many students receive this aid? 1984-85 | 1985-86 | Pre-1984 | Item 3: What's the max. $ value of this aid/yr?/std. | Item 3: How many $'s were allocated to this aid in 1984-85? | Item 3: Is this an inc. over last year? 1 = yes 0 = no | Item 3: How much (in $) of an inc. or dec. | Item 4: How much (in $) is allocated for 1985-86 | Item 5: Can this aid be used in conjunction w/other aid | Item 6: Residency and Citznshp. Reqrmts** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Item: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flwshps | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Asstshps | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Schlrshps | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Loan | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Grants | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Other (Specify) | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Form A, Pt. 2
Item 8

| Non-State (Private) Revenues for Black Doctoral Students (List) | Average Dollar Amount |
|---|---|
| 1) None | |
| 2) | |
| 3) | |
| 4) | |

** 1 = Native of State
2 = Current Resident
3 = 1 and 2
4 = Resident & Citizen
5 = No Limitations

Appendix B

List of Key Informants

## Persons Interviewed

**Arkansas**

Arkansas Department of Education

Ms. Cynthia Moten, Human Resources Coordinator

University of Arkansas

Dr. Barbara Taylor, Director of Human Relations

**Georgia**

Georgia Board of Regents

Dr. H. D. Propsts, Chancell

Dr. Thomas McDonald, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs

Georgia State University

Thomas Brewer, Vice President for Academic Affairs

Georgia Institute of Technology

Walter O. Carlson, Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies and Research

Helen Grenga, Associate Dean for Graduate Studies

University of Georgia

Harold W. Gentry, Associate Dean of the Graduate School

**Florida**

State University System Office

Mr. Peter DeHaan, Assistant Director of Equal Opportunity

Florida State University

Dr. Russell Johnson, Associate Graduate Dean

University of Florida

Dr. Rod McDavis, Assistant Dean of Graduate Studies

University of South Florida

Dr. Carl Riggs, Dean of the Graduate School, Coordinator of University Research

Dr. James Rennick, Assistant Dean, Graduate School

## Oklahoma

### Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education

Joe E. Hagy, State Plan Coordinator

### University of Oklahoma

Walter Mason, Affirmative Action Compliance Officer

### Oklahoma University Health Sciences Center

Beth Wilson, Affirmative Action Officer

Ralph Daniels, Associate Graduate Dean

### Oklahoma State University

Pauline Kopecky, Affirmative Action Officer

Kenneth R. Chance, Reports Analyst

## Virginia

### University of Virginia

Dr. William A. Elwood
Associate Dean - Arts & Science
University of Virginia
438 Cabell Hall
Charlottesville, VA 22903

### Virginia Commonwealth University

Dr. John H. McGrath
Associate Dean of the School of Graduate Studies
Virginia Commonwealth University
Box 568, MCV Station
Richmond, VA 23298

Tyree Felder
EEO Officer

Bud Kinder
Director of Financial Aid

### Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

Dr. Roger A. Teekell
Associate Dean - Graduate School
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
100 Sandy Hall
Blacksburg, VA 24061

### Old Dominion University

Dr. Lucy R. Wilson
Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs
Old Dominion University
New Administration Building
Norfolk, VA 23508

The College of William and Mary

Dr. Rolf G. Winter
Dean of Graduate School -
Arts & Science
The College of William & Mary
Williamsburg, VA 23185

Dale Robinson
EEO Officer

Council of Higher Education

James A. McClean
Coordinator of Affirmative Action
and Student Research

Appendix C

State Wide Plans

(Planned Commitments -

Excerpts from Plans Submitted

to the Office for Civil Rights (OCR)

for

Arkansas

Florida

Georgia

Oklahoma

Virginia

Arkansas Plan Commitments

D. Entrance to graduate and first-professional study (Criterion II.C) as

1. Statement of goal or commitment

A background analysis on entrance to graduate and professional study was conducted by Arkansas. The Plan reported the results of the study:

> In 1976, the proportion of Black state residents graduating from undergraduate programs at the nine public institutions in the state was 11.0%. In that same year, the proportion of Black students entering graduate and professional programs in seven of those same institutions was 6.7%.

Thus, Arkansas identified systemwide disparity at (11.0-6.7= 4.3%) and uses this when it states it commitment:

> The state of Arkansas will have reduced the disparity between the proportions of Black and White students enrolled in graduate and professional schools in the state system by 1981-82. Further, the current 4.3% disparity between Black and White graduates and enrollments in graduate and professional schools will have been reduced by approximately twenty five percent for the next four years. Thus, each year will expect a reduction of roughly one percentage point of the total 4.3% disparity. The reduction of one percent point per

year will be separate goals for the schools of law and medicine even though for these schools this will be a greater degree of improvement.

In addition to eliminating systemwide disparity, the state also committed to eliminating disparity for major fields of study. The disparity for Agriculture and Natural Resources, Architecture and Environmental Design, Biological Science, Business Management, Engineering, Physical Sciences and All other Fields was developed between the proportion of Black students graduating with undergraduate degrees in these major fields entering graduate programs in the respective major fields. For disparities in law and medicine, the total figures for all of the majors were used because "it is difficult to decide which undergraduate major fields all of the students will have graduated in that entered either law or medicine". The goal for major fields of study is to eliminate disparities by 1981-1982. The appropriate feeder disciplines for each major field is given in Exhibit 2.

2. Measures and assumptions

Although the State promised both to reduce the disparity between the proportion of Black and White total graduate/professional school enrollment as well as the disparity between Black/White college graduates and graduate/professional school entry of Black and White students, the State has reported progress in this area by submitting data which disclose the disparity between Black college graduates within the State and Black

graduate/professional school entry. For each academic year, the disparity for each major program (and for entrance into graduate and professional programs, as a whole) is computed using the following:

- Black baccalaureate graduates in the appropriate feeder disciplines as a percent of the total number of baccalaureate graduates in the appropriate feeder disciplines
- Black first-time enrollment in each graduate program as a percent of the total first-time enrollment in that graduate program
- Black first-year enrollment in each professional program as a percent of the total first-year enrollment in that professional program.

The disparity for the academic year shall be computed as the difference in the Black percent of baccalaureate graduates and the Black percent of first-time and first-year enrollment in graduate and professional programs, respectively. The stated goal for 1981-82 is that these disparity values have been eliminated (difference is not greater than zero).

It is assumed that appropriate feed disciplines are all undergraduate programs for those major fields not specifically addressed by Arkansas.

3. Source data and/or surrogates

The following data are required:

- Baccalaureate degrees awarded by discipline to within-state residents.

- First-year enrollment in first professional studies by discipline
- First-time enrollment in graduate studies by discipline.

4. Analysis Tables

Six tables are presented in the orginal report to examine the state's progress towards the stated goal. Tables II.C-1 and II.C-2 provide sufficient information for determining whether disparities have been eliminated. Tables II.C-3, II.C-4 and II.C-5 may be used if additional institutional information is required.

Table II.C-6 presents a summary of data across years. Data for 1978, 1979 and 1981 were derived from Table II.C-1 of the analysis reports for the OCR 4000, 5000 and 7000, respectively.

Florida Plan Commitments

(C) Increased Enrollments in Graduate and Professional Programs (HEW Criterion IIC)

The State University System has adopted the following goal in support of its committee to increase Black student enrollment in its graduate and professional programs:

**To enroll from the State University System Institutions first time graduate and professional students in black/white proportions which approximate the black/white proportions of students who graduate with bachelor's degrees and appropriate academic majors from institutions within the state university system. Each institution will make an equitable contribution toward meeting this goal within each of its major fields of graduate and professional studies.**

Recent enrollment data indicate the State University System is very close to meeting the overall intent of Criterion II-C. The percentage of Black graduates of the State University System who enroll in graduate and professional programs within the System is at least comparable to the percentage for White students.

Black students received 6.9 percent of the black/white total for Bachelor's Degrees awarded during 1975-76 and represented 6.8 percent of the first time in graduate school enrollments by students whose last institution was within the State University System. Although the precise data are not yet available on first time enrollments of System graduates by major graduate and professional program areas, each institution will make an equitable contribution toward

increasing Black enrollments in their graduate and professional programs to maintain achievement of this goal Systemwide. In particular, each of the professional schools and major graduate areas[5] within the System will strive to enroll Black students at no less than the proportion of Black students graduating with Baccalaureates.

(E) Achievement of Educational Goals

(HEW Criterion IIE)

The State University System reaffirms its commitment to one of the basic objectives of the 1974 Plan: To achieve equality of opportunity for all citizens beyond high school from beginning student through the doctoral, professional, and continuing educational levels. Implicit in this objective is the assurance that all students be provided effective personal and academic support to ensure achievement of educational goals.

In support of this objective, Florida makes the following commitment in accordance with Criterion II-E:

**For those students seeking degrees or certificates, Florida will examine the proportion of black and white students completing and graduating from public community colleges and universities, if any disparity exists, Florida will take reasonable steps required to reduce this disparity.**

[5]Major Graduate and Professional Programs include: Dentistry, Medicine, Law, Veterinary Medicine, Pharmacy, Architecture, Nursing, Engineering, Graduate Health Programs in addition to other graduate programs, including Teacher Education and Business Administration.

All institutions have implemented various types and forms of special supportive programs to address the special needs of students. Increased emphasis will be given to continued development and refinement of these programs in order to more adequately assist students to overcome any real or perceived academic deficiencies. Counseling, tutorial assistance, special orientation activities and financial aid are among the student services which have been developed to aid in the retention of Black students. The ultimate objective of reducing any disparity between the proportion of Black students and the proportion of white students seeking and earning degrees at all levels shall be a priority for all higher education institutions within the State University System.

Georgia Plan Commitments

D. Entrance to graduate and first professional study (Criterion II.C)

1. Statement of goal or commitment

In the Plan, per Criterion II.C, Georgia states that "at least equal proportions of Black and White state resident graduates from undergraduate institutions enter and graduate from state system graduate schools." However, Georgia continued to state that "a detailed review...reveals that a real and pervasive desegregation problem is concealed by these overall statistics." Detailed data "reveal that the preponderance of bachelors degrees received by Blacks are in the fields of business, education, and social science" while "a similar, but somewhat less pronounced, distribution of degrees awarded to Blacks, is noted at the masters level."

Specific numerical goals for entrance into graduate or professional studies by program were not provided in the Plan document.

The March 8, 1978 Letter provided clarifying material in support of the Plan document. Page 10 of this letter states:

> The Board of Regents adopts as a goal the continued parity of Black and White state residents who graduate from undergraduate

institutions and enter graduate or professional schools in the University System.

Also contained in the March 8, 1978 Letter was a table showing graduate and first professional enrollment projections from 1976 through 1982 for several major fields of study.

However, these enrollment projections were for total enrollment, not just entering enrollment. Therefore, the projected enrollments do not address directly the commitment made by Georgia.

2. Measures and assumptions

As stated in the March 8, 1978 Letter, the following measures will directly relate to the Georgia commitment:

- proportion of baccalaureate degrees granted to Black and White state residents in the immediately preceding year ;
- proportion of Black and White students entering each graduate/professional program in the current academic year.

It is assumed that appropriate feeder disciplines, for each graduate/professional program, are all undergraduate programs, i.e., all undergraduate degrees will be used as a baseline.

It should be noted that feeder programs are suggested by the table in the March 8, 1978 Letter. However, the precise definition of the undergraduate feeder programs is lacking in the plan documents.

3. Source data and/or surrogates

Evaluating progress towards "parity" will require the following:

- Baccalaureate degrees granted to within-state residents

  The OCR 7000 2300 2.1 (Earned Degrees) Supplement contains the data for baccalaureate degrees granted to state residents in academic year 1980-81.

- First-year enrollment in first-professional studies by discipline

  The OCR 7000 2300 2.3 (Fall Enrollment) Supplement contains the data for both full-time and part-time enrollment.

- First-time enrollment in graduate studies by discipline

  These data come from the 1981-82 ED (NCES) 2300-2.3 (Fall Enrollment) form lines 12 (full-time) and 26 (part-time).

- First-time within-state professional enrollment

  The OCR 7000 B1 form provides the data on lines 27, 30 and 33.

- First-time within-state graduate enrollment

  The OCR 7000 B1 form provides the data on lines 54, 57 and 60.

4. Analysis tables

Six tables are presented to examine Georgia's progress per Criterion II.C. Table II.C-1 provides the statewide

summary with regards to total graduate and professional enrollment. Table II.C-2 provides information for graduate programs by major field of study. Table II.C-3 provides information on entrance into professional institutions.

Tables II.C-4 and II.C-5 present 1981-82 entering graduate and professional enrollment for within-state residents only. Table II.C-4 presents a statewide summary, while Table II.C-5 presents institutional detail. Table II.C-6 presents a summary of data across years for within-state residents.

E. Proportion of White students at traditionally Black institutions (Criterion II.D)

1. Statement of goal or commitment

In the Plan, Georgia provided numerical goals for "other" student enrollment at the three traditionally Black institutions. These were subsequently withdrawn in the December 15, 1977 Letter. Therefore, Georgia will be examined as per Criterion II.D which states:

> Adopt the goal of increasing the total proportion of White students attending traditionally Black institutions.

2. Measures and assumptions

With respect to the language of the Criteria, a measure of the proportion of White students attending the three traditionally Black institutions of the Georgia University System is relevant.

It is assumed that unclassified students should be included and that graduate and first-professional data are to be included if relevant.

3. Source data and/or surrogates

Summary enrollment data will come from the 1981-82 ED (NCES) 2300-2.3 (Fall Enrollment) form - summary page (with major field code 9999). Undergraduate enrollment data are on lines 1 (full-time) and 15 (part-time); post-baccalaureate enrollment are on lines 10 and 11 (full-time) and 24 and 25 (part-time); unclassified students are on lines 8 and 9 (full-time) and 22 and 23 (part-time).

4. Analysis tables

Three tables are presented to analyze White student enrollment at traditionally Black institutions. Table II.D-1 provides the statewide summary for the White student enrollment at the traditionally Black institutions, taken as a whole. Table II.D-2 provides student enrollment at each of the Black institutions. Table II.D-3 presents a summary of progress across years. Data for 1978, 1979 and 1981 were derived from Table II.D-1 of the analysis reports for the OCR 4000, 5000 and 7000, respectively.

Oklahoma Plan Commitments

D. Entrance to graduate and first professional study (Criterion II.C)

1. Statement of goal or commitment

Supplement II states:

> It is the goal of the State Regents that the proportion of Black state residents, who graduate from undergraduate institutions in the State System and enter graduate study or professional schools in the State System, shall be at least equal to the proportion of White state residents who graduate from undergraduate institutions in the State System and enter such school.

When the Revised State Plan was submitted (in September 1977), "one of 3.76 Black baccalaureates in Oklahoma continued on to graduate school as compared to a ratio of one out of five White baccalaureate degrees. At the same time, only one in 57 Blacks pursued professional education as compared to one of 13.7 White baccalaureate graduates. The State of Oklahoma...must strive to (1) maintain its present level of accomplishment while (2) attempting to equalize the distribution across fields." (Revised State Plan)

2. Measures and assumptions

As stated in Supplement II, and as illustrated in the 1980 Annual Report, "...numerical goals will be based upon a comparison of the racial proportions of students earning baccalaureate degrees, with the racial proportions of students entering graduate or professional programs." Therefore, the following measures will directly relate to the stated goal:

- ratio of Black baccaluareate degree within state graduates to White baccalaureate degree within state graduates for the immediately preceding year
- ratio of Black within state students entering graduate/professional programs to White within state students entering graduate/professional programs.

In the first ratio is less than or equal to the latter ratio, then Oklahoma can be said to have achieved its stated goal. The ratios shall be for graduate and professional programs, taken as a whole, as well as for individual major fields of study.

In addition, the 1979 Anual Report provided revised numerical projections of Black resident students in each professional school's entering class. (Appendix L, pages 152-154 of 1979 Annual Report.) These projections are shown in Exhibit 3. The goals for first-year graduate enrollment by area of study were provided in Table One of the Goals for Graduate and Professional Students.

F. Completion of higher education studies (Criterion II.E)

1. State of goal or commitment

The Revised State Plan states:

> The Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education are committed to an absolute reduction of any disparity between the population of Black and White students graduating with baccalaureate, master's, and doctoral degrees. The reflection of this commitment is made in Table Three which realistically details the progression of increasing numbers of Black students through the various degree levels.

Table Three, page 26 of the Revised State Plan, was subsequently revised. Firstly, the variance figures of plus or minus 25 ;ercent were withdrawn by Oklahoma (Supplement I to the Revised State Plan, page 9). Secondly, the incremental goals to increase degrees granted were updated. In the 1979 Annual Report, as stated in page 17 of the 1979 Annual Report, "...these new projections bring the goals closer to a more probable reality and are based on unit data that has a higher degree of accuracy and reliability than the aggregate data used in the original projections." The numerical goals from page 90 of the 1979 Annual Report are shown in Exhibit 6. The numerical goals of Exhibit 6 were based on enrollment figures given in

Exhibit 7 (1979 Annual Report, page 91) for 1980-81 academic year.

2. Measures and assumptions

The goals for Bachelor's, Master's and Doctoral degrees as given in Exhibit 6 were developed using the model that:

- the Black/White ratio of Bachelor's degrees awarded should resemble the Black/White ratio of the beginning college senior class of the same year
- the Black/White ratio of the Master's degrees awarded should resemble the Black/White ratio of the Bachelor's degrees awarded two years previously
- the Black/White ratio of the Doctor's degrees awarded should resemble the Black/White ratio of the Master's degrees awarded three years previously.

The methodology presented in Exhibit 6 will be used to determine the applicable goals rather than using the specific goals given in Exhibit 6.

Virginia Plan Commitments

D. Entrance to graduate and first professional study (Criterion II.C)

1. State of goal or commitment

In the Revised State Plan (page 64), Virginia states:

> The Commonwealth of Virginia is committed to take all reasonable steps to eliminate by major fields of study whatever disparity exists between the proportion of Black and White State residents who graduate from undergraduate institutions in the State system and enter graduate study or professional schools in the State system.

Interim objectives were presented on page 66 of the Revised State Plan. These "indicate the tentative percentage increases the Commonwealth will strive to achieve by 1982-83. The objectives will be revised periodically to reflect improved data and changes in graduation rates" (Revised State Plan, page 67). The interim objectives are reproduced in Exhibit 3.

It should be noted that in computing entrance rates (for the system as a whole as well as by major fields of study), Virginia used total baccalaureate degrees granted to state residents. The state did not distinguish among undergraduate feeder programs.

2. Measures and assumptions

The following measures will directly relate to the stated goal:

- the percent of Black baccalaureate degree graduates who enter graduate or professional studies
- the percent of White baccalaureate degree graduates who enter graduate or professional studies.

If the first percentage is greater than or equal to the second, Virginia can be said to have achieved its stated goal. The percentages shall be for graduate and professional programs, taken as a whole, as well as for individual major fields of study. The appropriate baseline to be used is total baccalaureate degrees granted to state residents in the immediately preceding year.

3. Source data and/or surrogates

The following data elements are required:

a. Baccalaureate degrees granted by Virginia to state residents

The OCR 7000 2300 2.1 Supplement contains the data for baccalaureate degrees granted in academic year 1980-81 to state residents.

F. Completion of higher education studies (Criterion II.E)

1. Statement of goal or commitment

The Revised State Plan (page 69) specifies the goal as follows:

Through the efforts of the Council of Higher Education and the individual institutions, the State will take all reasonable steps to identify and then reduce any disparity that is found to exist between the proportion

of Black and White students completing and graduating from the two-year, four-year, and graduate state-supported institutions of higher education.

Virginia has completed a study related to Criterion II.E which tracks cohorts of students (Comparision of Retention and Completion Rates of Black and White Freshmen Who Enrolled in Virginia State-Supported Institutions of Higher Education in Fall 1975). However, this study of cohorts cannot be replicated using data from the OCR forms. The analysis methodology shown in this section is another way of examining the issue.

2. Measures and assumptions

In order to calculate retention/completion rates, the methodology must use data over a given time period. The retention rates for White students and for Black students are computed and compared. Then the difference in the retention rates are computed for an indication of the disparity between completion rates for Black and White students.

The retention/completion rate is defined as:

- the number of students in a given class standing divided into the number of students who progress to the next class standing within a year's time.

As an example, the number of Black freshmen in 1980-81 divided into the number of Black second-year undergraduate students in 1981-82 gives a retention rate

for progression from freshmen to second-year class standing for Black students. It should be noted that for some class standings (e.g. seniors) the logical progression is a degree (e.g. Baccalaureate degree) at the end of the academic year.

It is assumed that only data for full-time students are to be used; full-time students would be expected to progres to the next class standing in a year's time.

Appendix D

Degree Attainment by Race/Ethnicity in Traditionally Black and White Adams Public Colleges

Tables

Table 7

GRADUATE ENROLLMENT BY RACE/ETHNICITY IN TRADITIONALLY
BLACK AND WHITE ADAMS PUBLIC COLLEGES
1976-1982

| State: ARKANSAS<br>Year | 1976 | | | 1978 | | | 1980 | | | 1982 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Enrollment Status<br>Race/Ethnicity<br>College Race | TBI | TWI | TOTAL | TBI | TWI | TOTAL | TBI | TWI | TOTAL | TBI | TWI | TOTAL |
| **Full-time Graduate** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non-Resident Alien | 0 | 137 | 137 | 0 | 179 | 179 | 0 | 199 | 199 | 0 | 184 | 184 |
| 2 Black | 0 | 135 | 135 | 0 | 142 | 142 | 0 | 131 | 131 | 0 | 87 | 87 |
| 3 American Indian | 0 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 21 | 21 | 0 | 26 | 26 | 0 | 11 | 11 |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | 0 | 26 | 26 | 0 | 17 | 17 | 0 | 30 | 30 | 0 | 21 | 21 |
| 5 Hispanic | 0 | 7 | 7 | 0 | 15 | 15 | 0 | 17 | 17 | 0 | 8 | 8 |
| 6 White | 0 | 1788 | 1788 | 0 | 1740 | 1740 | 0 | 1985 | 1985 | 0 | 1367 | 1367 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 2102 | 2102 | 0 | 2114 | 2114 | 0 | 2388 | 2388 | 0 | 1678 | 1678 |
| **Part-time Graduate** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non-Resident Alien | 0 | 23 | 23 | 0 | 27 | 27 | 0 | 40 | 40 | 0 | 94 | 94 |
| 2 Black | 0 | 271 | 271 | 0 | 275 | 275 | 0 | 352 | 352 | 0 | 285 | 285 |
| 3 American Indian | 0 | 13 | 13 | 0 | 17 | 17 | 0 | 22 | 22 | 0 | 26 | 26 |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | 0 | 17 | 17 | 0 | 21 | 21 | 0 | 19 | 19 | 0 | 30 | 30 |
| 5 Hispanic | 0 | 7 | 7 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 7 | 0 | 14 | 14 |
| 6 White | 0 | 2765 | 2765 | 0 | 3120 | 3120 | 0 | 3307 | 3307 | 0 | 3312 | 3312 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 3096 | 3096 | 0 | 3464 | 3464 | 0 | 3747 | 3747 | 0 | 3761 | 3761 |
| **First Professional** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non-Resident Alien | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 Black | 0 | 39 | 39 | 0 | 53 | 53 | 0 | 61 | 61 | 0 | 48 | 48 |
| 3 American Indian | 0 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 9 | 9 |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | 0 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 13 | 13 | 0 | 15 | 15 | 0 | 7 | 7 |
| 5 Hispanic | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| 6 White | 0 | 993 | 993 | 0 | 1131 | 1131 | 0 | 1160 | 1160 | 0 | 1129 | 1129 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 1050 | 1050 | 0 | 1207 | 1207 | 0 | 1244 | 1244 | 0 | 1196 | 1196 |

Table 8

PERCENTAGES

GRADUATE ENROLLMENT BY RACE/ETHNICITY IN TRADITIONALLY
BLACK AND WHITE ADAMS PUBLIC COLLEGES
1976-1982

| State: ARKANSAS / Year | 1976 | | | 1978 | | | 1980 | | | 1982 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Enrollment Status / Race/Ethnicity / College Race | TBI | TWI | TOTAL | TBI | TWI | TOTAL | TBI | TWI | TOTAL | TBI | TWI | TOTAL |
| | | % | % | | | | | | | | | |
| **Full-time Graduate** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non-Resident Alien | | 6.52 | 6.52 | | 8.47 | 8.47 | | 8.33 | 8.33 | | 10.97 | 10.97 |
| 2 Black | | 6.42 | 6.42 | | 6.72 | 6.72 | | 5.57 | 5.57 | | 5.19 | 5.19 |
| 3 American Indian | | .43 | .43 | | .99 | .99 | | 1.09 | 1.09 | | .66 | .66 |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | | 1.24 | 1.24 | | .80 | .80 | | 1.26 | 1.26 | | 1.25 | 1.25 |
| 5 Hispanic | | .33 | .33 | | .71 | .71 | | 3.22 | 3.22 | | .98 | .98 |
| 6 White | | 85.06 | 85.06 | | 82.31 | 82.31 | | 83.12 | 83.12 | | 81.47 | 81.47 |
| TOTAL | | 2,102 | 2,102 | | 2,114 | 2,114 | | 2,388 | 2,388 | | 1,678 | 1,678 |
| **Part-time Graduate** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non-Resident Alien | | .74 | .74 | | .78 | .78 | | 1.07 | 1.07 | | 2.50 | 2.50 |
| 2 Black | | 8.75 | 8.74 | | 7.94 | 7.94 | | .09 | .09 | | 7.58 | 7.58 |
| 3 American Indian | | .42 | .42 | | .49 | .49 | | .59 | .59 | | .64 | .64 |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | | .55 | .55 | | .61 | .61 | | .51 | .51 | | .80 | .80 |
| 5 Hispanic | | .23 | .23 | | .12 | .12 | | .19 | .19 | | .37 | .37 |
| 6 White | | 89.02 | 89.02 | | 90.07 | 90.07 | | 88.26 | 88.26 | | 88.06 | 88.06 |
| TOTAL | | 3,096 | 3,096 | | 3,464 | 3,464 | | 3,747 | 3,747 | | 3,761 | 3,761 |
| **First Professional** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non-Resident Alien | | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 |
| 2 Black | | 3.69 | 3.69 | | 4.39 | 4.39 | | 4.90 | 4.90 | | 4.01 | 4.01 |
| 3 American Indian | | .48 | .48 | | .50 | .50 | | .32 | .32 | | .75 | .75 |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | | .95 | .95 | | 1.08 | 1.08 | | 1.21 | 1.21 | | .59 | .59 |
| 5 Hispanic | | .29 | .27 | | .33 | .33 | | .32 | .32 | | .25 | .25 |
| 6 White | | 94.57 | 94.57 | | 93.70 | 93.70 | | 93.25 | 93.25 | | 94.40 | 94.40 |
| TOTAL | | 1,050 | 1,050 | | 1,207 | 1,207 | | 1,244 | 1,244 | | 1,196 | 1,196 |

Table 9

GRADUATE ENROLLMENT BY RACE/ETHNICITY IN TRADITIONALLY
BLACK AND WHITE ADAMS PUBLIC COLLEGES
1976-1982

| State: FLORIDA<br>Year | 1976 | | | 1978 | | | 1980 | | | 1982 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Enrollment Status<br>Race/Ethnicity<br>College Race | TBI | TWI | TOTAL | TBI | TWI | TOTAL | TBI | TWI | TOTAL | TBI | TWI | TOTAL |
| **Full-time Graduate** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non-Resident Alien | 0 | 634 | 634 | 3 | 647 | 650 | 0 | 808 | 808 | 6 | 1068 | 1074 |
| 2 Black | 65 | 290 | 355 | 48 | 323 | 371 | 21 | 364 | 385 | 64 | 289 | 353 |
| 3 American Indian | 0 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 13 | 13 | 0 | 16 | 16 | 0 | 10 | 10 |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | 1 | 44 | 45 | 1 | 69 | 70 | 1 | 101 | 102 | 1 | 68 | 69 |
| 5 Hispanic | 0 | 204 | 204 | 0 | 249 | 249 | 1 | 291 | 292 | 1 | 205 | 206 |
| 6 White | 23 | 6643 | 6666 | 9 | 6529 | 6538 | 8 | 6577 | 6585 | 16 | 5764 | 5780 |
| TOTAL | 89 | 7824 | 7913 | 61 | 7830 | 7891 | 31 | 8157 | 8188 | 88 | 7404 | 7492 |
| **Part-time Graduate** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non-Resident Alien | 0 | 139 | 139 | 4 | 160 | 164 | 0 | 221 | 221 | 1 | 351 | 352 |
| 2 Black | 40 | 310 | 350 | 390 | 318 | 708 | 60 | 373 | 433 | 51 | 423 | 474 |
| 3 American Indian | 0 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 11 | 11 | 0 | 11 | 11 | 0 | 16 | 16 |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | 3 | 38 | 41 | 1 | 40 | 41 | 0 | 47 | 47 | 1 | 66 | 67 |
| 5 Hispanic | 1 | 193 | 194 | 1 | 194 | 195 | 0 | 285 | 285 | 1 | 407 | 408 |
| 6 White | 7 | 5759 | 5766 | 201 | 6079 | 6180 | 21 | 6927 | 6948 | 42 | 8343 | 8385 |
| TOTAL | 51 | 6449 | 6500 | 597 | 6802 | 7399 | 81 | 7864 | 7945 | 96 | 9606 | 9702 |
| **First Professional** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non-Resident Alien | 0 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 7 | 0 | 8 | 8 |
| 2 Black | 0 | 121 | 121 | 0 | 132 | 132 | 14 | 108 | 122 | 14 | 136 | 150 |
| 3 American Indian | 0 | 7 | 7 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 11 | 11 | 0 | 29 | 29 |
| 5 Hispanic | 0 | 62 | 62 | 0 | 104 | 104 | 0 | 110 | 110 | 0 | 128 | 128 |
| 6 White | 0 | 2047 | 2047 | 0 | 2374 | 2374 | 2 | 2562 | 2564 | 0 | 2627 | 2627 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 2247 | 2247 | 0 | 2627 | 2627 | 16 | 2800 | 2816 | 0 | 2831 | 2845 |

Table 10

PERCENTAGES

GRADUATE ENROLLMENT BY RACE/ETHNICITY IN TRADITIONALLY
BLACK AND WHITE ADAMS PUBLIC COLLEGES
1976-1982

| State: FLORIDA / Year | 1976 | | | 1978 | | | 1980 | | | 1982 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Enrollment Status / Race/Ethnicity / College Race | TBI | TWI | TOTAL | TBI | TWI | TOTAL | TBI | TWI | TOTAL | TBI | TWI | TOTAL |
| | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % |
| **Full-time Graduate** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non-Resident Alien | 0 | 8.10 | 8.01 | 4.92 | 8.26 | 8.34 | 0 | 9.91 | 9.87 | 6.82 | 14.42 | 14.34 |
| 2 Black | 73.03 | 3.71 | 4.49 | 61.92 | 4.13 | 4.70 | 67.74 | 9.46 | 4.70 | 12.73 | 3.90 | 4.71 |
| 3 American Indian | 0 | .12 | .11 | 0 | .17 | .17 | 0 | .20 | .20 | 0 | .14 | .13 |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | 1.12 | 2.61 | .57 | 1.64 | .88 | .89 | 3.23 | 13.50 | 1.25 | 1.14 | .99 | .92 |
| 5 Hispanic | 0 | .07 | 2.58 | 0 | 3.18 | 3.16 | 3.23 | 3.57 | 3.57 | 0 | 2.77 | 2.75 |
| 6 White | 25.84 | 84.70 | 84.24 | 14.75 | 83.34 | 82.85 | 25.81 | 80.63 | 80.42 | 18.18 | 77.85 | 77.15 |
| TOTAL | 89 | 7,824 | 7,913 | 61 | 7,830 | 7,891 | 31 | 8,157 | 8,188 | 88 | 7,404 | 7,492 |
| **Part-time Graduate** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non-Resident Alien | 0 | 2.16 | 2.19 | .67 | 2.35 | 2.22 | 0 | 2.81 | 2.78 | 1.04 | 3.65 | 3.63 |
| 2 Black | 74.43 | 4.81 | .03 | 65.33 | 4.68 | 9.57 | 74.07 | 2.03 | 5.45 | 53.13 | 4.41 | 4.88 |
| 3 American Indian | 0 | .16 | .15 | 0 | .17 | .15 | 0 | .14 | .14 | 0 | .17 | .17 |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | .35 | .59 | .63 | .17 | .59 | .55 | 0 | .60 | .59 | 1.04 | .69 | .69 |
| 5 Hispanic | 1.96 | 2.99 | 2.99 | .17 | 2.85 | 2.64 | 0 | 3.62 | 3.59 | 1.04 | 4.24 | 4.21 |
| 6 White | 13.73 | 89.30 | 88.71 | 33.67 | 89.37 | 84.88 | 25.93 | 88.09 | 87.42 | 43.75 | 86.85 | 86.43 |
| TOTAL | 51 | 6,449 | 6,500 | 597 | 6,802 | 7,399 | 81 | 7,864 | 7,945 | 96 | 9,606 | 9,702 |
| **First Professional** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non-Resident Alien | | .27 | .27 | 0 | .08 | .08 | 0 | .25 | .25 | 0 | .28 | .28 |
| 2 Black | | 5.39 | 5.39 | 0 | 5.03 | 5.03 | 87.05 | 3.86 | 4.33 | 100.00 | 4.80 | 5.27 |
| 3 American Indian | | .31 | .31 | 0 | .23 | .23 | 0 | .07 | .07 | 0 | .11 | .11 |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | | .18 | .18 | 0 | .34 | .34 | 0 | .39 | .39 | 0 | .04 | 1.02 |
| 5 Hispanic | | 2.76 | 2.76 | 0 | 3.96 | 3.96 | 0 | 3.93 | .15 | 0 | 4.52 | 4.50 |
| 6 White | | 91.10 | 91.10 | 0 | 90.37 | 90.37 | 12.50 | 91.90 | 91.05 | 0 | 89.26 | 88.82 |
| TOTAL | | 2,247 | 2,247 | 0 | 2,627 | 2,627 | 16 | 2,800 | 2,816 | 14 | 2,831 | 2,845 |

## Table 11

GRADUATE ENROLLMENT BY RACE/ETHNICITY IN TRADITIONALLY
BLACK AND WHITE ADAMS PUBLIC COLLEGES
1976-1982

| State: GEORGIA / Year | 1976 | | | 1978 | | | 1980 | | | 1982 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Enrollment Status / Race/Ethnicity / College Race | TBI | TWI | TOTAL | TBI | TWI | TOTAL | TBI | TWI | TOTAL | TBI | TWI | TOTAL |
| **Full-time Graduate** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non-Resident Alien | 1 | 432 | 433 | 0 | 513 | 513 | 0 | 732 | 732 | 0 | 886 | 886 |
| 2 Black | 32 | 664 | 696 | 26 | 727 | 753 | 8 | 423 | 431 | 11 | 405 | 416 |
| 3 American Indian | 0 | 22 | 22 | 0 | 7 | 7 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 15 | 15 |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | 0 | 34 | 34 | 0 | 51 | 51 | 0 | 56 | 56 | 0 | 146 | 146 |
| 5 Hispanic | 0 | 25 | 25 | 0 | 33 | 33 | 0 | 44 | 44 | 0 | 95 | 95 |
| 6 White | 2 | 6650 | 6652 | 11 | 6035 | 6046 | 13 | 5506 | 5519 | 4 | 5791 | 5795 |
| TOTAL | 35 | 7827 | 7862 | 37 | 7366 | 7403 | 21 | 6766 | 6787 | 15 | 7338 | 7353 |
| **Part-time Graduate** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non-Resident Alien | 3 | 212 | 215 | 1 | 309 | 310 | 0 | 269 | 269 | 2 | 168 | 170 |
| 2 Black | 221 | 1127 | 1348 | 106 | 1194 | 1300 | 66 | 1147 | 1213 | 154 | 881 | 1035 |
| 3 American Indian | 0 | 31 | 31 | 0 | 19 | 19 | 0 | 13 | 13 | 0 | 17 | 17 |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | 2 | 47 | 49 | 2 | 58 | 60 | 0 | 60 | 60 | 2 | 78 | 80 |
| 5 Hispanic | 1 | 15 | 16 | 0 | 20 | 20 | 0 | 63 | 63 | 2 | 54 | 56 |
| 6 White | 262 | 8806 | 9086 | 115 | 9648 | 9763 | 36 | 9921 | 9957 | 108 | 8588 | 8696 |
| TOTAL | 489 | 10238 | 10727 | 224 | 11248 | 11472 | 102 | 11473 | 11575 | 268 | 9786 | 10054 |
| **First Professional** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non-Resident Alien | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 12 | 12 | 0 | 6 | 6 |
| 2 Black | 0 | 53 | 53 | 0 | 68 | 68 | 0 | 97 | 97 | 0 | 123 | 123 |
| 3 American Indian | 0 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 7 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | 0 | 7 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 7 | 0 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 20 | 20 |
| 5 Hispanic | 0 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 11 | 11 | 0 | 14 | 14 | 0 | 22 | 22 |
| 6 White | 0 | 1709 | 1709 | 0 | 1762 | 1762 | 0 | 1821 | 1821 | 0 | 1945 | 1945 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 1784 | 1784 | 0 | 1855 | 1855 | 0 | 1960 | 1960 | 0 | 2117 | 2117 |

## Table 12

PERCENTAGES

GRADUATE ENROLLMENT BY RACE/ETHNICITY IN TRADITIONALLY
BLACK AND WHITE ADAMS PUBLIC COLLEGES
1976-1982

| State: GEORGIA<br>Year | 1976 | | | 1978 | | | 1980 | | | 1982 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Enrollment Status<br>Race/Ethnicity<br>College Race | TBI | TWI | TOTAL | TBI | TWI | TOTAL | TBI | TWI | TOTAL | TBI | TWI | TOTAL |
| **Full-time Graduate** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non-Resident Alien | 2.86 | 5.52 | 5.51 | 0 | 6.96 | 6.93 | 0 | 10.82 | 10.79 | 0 | 12.07 | 12.05 |
| 2 Black | 91.43 | 8.48 | 8.85 | 70.27 | 9.81 | 10.16 | 38.10 | 6.25 | 6.35 | 73.33 | 5.52 | 5.66 |
| 3 American Indian | 0 | .28 | .28 | 0 | .10 | .10 | 0 | .01 | .01 | 0 | .20 | .20 |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | 0 | .43 | .43 | 0 | .69 | .69 | 0 | .83 | .83 | 0 | 1.99 | 1.99 |
| 5 Hispanic | 0 | .32 | .32 | 0 | .45 | .45 | 0 | .65 | .65 | 0 | 1.30 | 1.29 |
| 6 White | 5.71 | 84.96 | 84.61 | 29.73 | 81.93 | 81.67 | 61.91 | 81.38 | 81.32 | 26.67 | 78.92 | 78.81 |
| TOTAL | 35 | 7,827 | 7,862 | 37 | 7,366 | 7,403 | 21 | 6,766 | 6,787 | 15 | 7,338 | 7,353 |
| **Part-time Graduate** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non-Resident Alien | .61 | 2.07 | 2.00 | .45 | 2.75 | 2.70 | 0 | 2.35 | 2.32 | .75 | 1.72 | 1.69 |
| 2 Black | 45.19 | 11.01 | 12.57 | 47.32 | 10.62 | 11.33 | 64.71 | 10.00 | 10.48 | 57.46 | 9.00 | 10.29 |
| 3 American Indian | 0 | .30 | .29 | 0 | .17 | .16 | 0 | .11 | .11 | 0 | .17 | .17 |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | .41 | .46 | .46 | .89 | .52 | .52 | 0 | .52 | .52 | .75 | .80 | .80 |
| 5 Hispanic | .21 | .15 | .15 | 0 | .18 | .17 | 0 | .55 | .54 | .75 | .55 | .56 |
| 6 White | 53.58 | 86.01 | 84.53 | 21.34 | 85.78 | 84.10 | 35.29 | 86.41 | 86.02 | 40.30 | 87.76 | 86.49 |
| TOTAL | 4.89 | 10,238 | 10,727 | 224 | 11,248 | 11,472 | 102 | 11,413 | 11,575 | 268 | 9,786 | 10,054 |
| **First Professional** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non-Resident Alien | | .11 | .11 | | .05 | .05 | | .61 | .61 | | .28 | .28 |
| 2 Black | | 3.10 | 3.10 | | 3.67 | 3.67 | | 4.95 | 4.95 | | 5.81 | 5.81 |
| 3 American Indian | | .28 | .28 | | .32 | .32 | | .36 | .36 | | .05 | .05 |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | | .39 | .39 | | .38 | .38 | | .46 | .46 | | .95 | .95 |
| 5 Hispanic | | .45 | .45 | | .59 | .59 | | .71 | .71 | | 1.04 | 1.04 |
| 6 White | | 95.80 | 95.80 | | 94.99 | 94.99 | | 92.91 | 92.91 | | 91.88 | 91.88 |
| TOTAL | | 1,784 | 1,780 | | 1,855 | 1,855 | | 1,960 | 1,960 | | 2,117 | 2,117 |

Table 13

GRADUATE ENROLLMENT BY RACE/ETHNICITY IN TRADITIONALLY
BLACK AND WHITE ADAMS PUBLIC COLLEGES
1976-1982

| State: OKLAHOMA<br>Year | 1976 | | | 1978 | | | 1980 | | | 1982 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Enrollment Status<br>Race/Ethnicity<br>College Race | TBI | TWI | TOTAL | TBI | TWI | TOTAL | TBI | TWI | TOTAL | TBI | TWI | TOTAL |
| **Full-time Graduate** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non-Resident Alien | 0 | 861 | 861 | 0 | 1041 | 1041 | 0 | 1053 | 1053 | 0 | 1127 | 1127 |
| 2 Black | 0 | 174 | 174 | 0 | 135 | 135 | 0 | 149 | 149 | 0 | 128 | 128 |
| 3 American Indian | 0 | 103 | 103 | 0 | 103 | 103 | 0 | 122 | 122 | 0 | 111 | 111 |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | 0 | 49 | 49 | 0 | 33 | 33 | 0 | 74 | 74 | 0 | 62 | 62 |
| 5 Hispanic | 0 | 24 | 24 | 0 | 27 | 27 | 0 | 63 | 63 | 0 | 33 | 33 |
| 6 White | 0 | 3246 | 3246 | 0 | 2753 | 2753 | 0 | 2688 | 2688 | 0 | 2667 | 2667 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 4457 | 4457 | 0 | 4092 | 4092 | 0 | 4149 | 4149 | 0 | 4128 | 4128 |
| **Part-time Graduate** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non-Resident Alien | 0 | 478 | 478 | 0 | 362 | 362 | 0 | 379 | 379 | 0 | 518 | 518 |
| 2 Black | 0 | 442 | 442 | 0 | 311 | 311 | 0 | 301 | 301 | 0 | 418 | 418 |
| 3 American Indian | 0 | 210 | 210 | 0 | 220 | 220 | 0 | 276 | 276 | 0 | 275 | 275 |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | 0 | 50 | 50 | 0 | 36 | 36 | 0 | 73 | 73 | 0 | 57 | 57 |
| 5 Hispanic | 0 | 35 | 35 | 0 | 35 | 35 | 0 | 52 | 52 | 0 | 58 | 58 |
| 6 White | 0 | 7207 | 7207 | 0 | 6341 | 6341 | 0 | 7451 | 7451 | 0 | 7884 | 7884 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 8422 | 8422 | 0 | 7305 | 7305 | 0 | 8532 | 8532 | 0 | 9210 | 9210 |
| **First Professional** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non-Resident Alien | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| 2 Black | 0 | 19 | 19 | 0 | 31 | 31 | 0 | 35 | 35 | 0 | 37 | 37 |
| 3 American Indian | 0 | 42 | 42 | 0 | 51 | 51 | 0 | 47 | 47 | 0 | 56 | 56 |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | 0 | 7 | 7 | 0 | 22 | 22 | 0 | 22 | 22 | 0 | 28 | 28 |
| 5 Hispanic | 0 | 11 | 11 | 0 | 20 | 20 | 0 | 25 | 25 | 0 | 30 | 30 |
| 6 White | 0 | 1615 | 1615 | 0 | 1933 | 1933 | 0 | 1963 | 1963 | 0 | 1944 | 1944 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 1694 | 1694 | 0 | 2061 | 2061 | 0 | 2096 | 2096 | 0 | 2097 | 2097 |

Table 14

GRADUATE ENROLLMENT BY RACE/ETHNICITY IN TRADITIONALLY
BLACK AND WHITE ADAMS PUBLIC COLLEGES
1976-1982

| State: OKLAHOMA<br>Year | 1976 | | | 1978 | | | 1980 | | | 1982 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Enrollment Status<br>Race/Ethnicity<br>College Race | TBI | TWI | TOTAL | TBI | TWI | TOTAL | TBI | TWI | TOTAL | TBI | TWI | TOTAL |
| **Full-time Graduate** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non-Resident Alien | | 19.3% | 19.3% | | 25.4% | 25.4% | | 25.4% | 25.4% | | 27.3% | 27.3% |
| 2 Black | | 3.9% | 3.9% | | 3.3% | 3.3% | | 3.6% | 3.6% | | 3.1% | 3.1% |
| 3 American Indian | | 2.3% | 2.3% | | 2.5% | 2.5% | | 2.9% | 2.9% | | 2.7% | 2.7% |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | | 1.1% | 1.1% | | .8% | .8% | | 1.8% | 1.8% | | 1.5% | 1.5% |
| 5 Hispanic | | .5% | .5% | | .7% | .7% | | 1.5% | 1.5% | | .8% | .8% |
| 6 White | | 72.8 | 72.8% | | 67.3% | 67.3% | | 64.8% | 64.8% | | 64.6% | 64.6% |
| TOTAL | | 4,457 | 4,457 | | 4,092 | 4,092 | | 4,149 | 4,149 | | 4,128 | 4,128 |
| **Part-time Graduate** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non-Resident Alien | | 5.7% | 5.7% | | 5.0% | 5.0% | | 4.4% | 4.4% | | 5.6% | 5.6% |
| 2 Black | | 5.2% | 5.2% | | 4.3% | 4.3 | | 3.5 | 3.5 | | 4.5 | 4.5 |
| 3 American Indian | | 2.5% | 2.5% | | 3.0 | 3.0 | | 3.2 | 3.2 | | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | | .6% | .6% | | .5 | .5 | | .9 | .9 | | .6 | .6 |
| 5 Hispanic | | .4% | .4% | | .5 | .5 | | .6 | .6 | | .6 | .6 |
| 6 White | | 85.6% | 85.6% | | 86.8 | 86.8 | | 87.3 | 87.3 | | 85.6 | 85.6 |
| TOTAL | | 8,422 | 8,422 | | 7,305 | 7,305 | | 8,532 | 8,532 | | 9,210 | 9,210 |
| **First Professional** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non-Resident Alien | | | | | .2% | .2 | | .2 | .2 | | .1 | .1 |
| 2 Black | | 1.1 | 1.1 | | 1.5 | 1.5 | | 1.7 | 1.7 | | 1.8 | 1.8 |
| 3 American Indian | | 2.5 | 2.5 | | 2.5 | 2.5 | | 2.2 | 2.2 | | 2.7 | 2.7 |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | | .4 | .4 | | 1.1 | 1.1 | | 1.0 | 1.0 | | 1.3 | 1.3 |
| 5 Hispanic | | .6 | .6 | | 1.0 | 1.0 | | 1.2 | 1.2 | | 1.4 | 1.4 |
| 6 White | | 95.3 | 95.3 | | 93.8 | 93.8 | | 98.7 | 93.7 | | 92.7 | 92.7 |
| TOTAL | | 1,694 | 1,694 | | 2,061 | 2,061 | | 2,096 | 2,096 | | 2,097 | 2,097 |

Table 15

GRADUATE ENROLLMENT BY RACE/ETHNICITY IN TRADITIONALLY
BLACK AND WHITE ADAMS PUBLIC COLLEGES
1976-1982

| State: VIRGINIA<br>Year | 1976 | | | 1978 | | | 1980 | | | 1982 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Enrollment Status<br>Race/Ethnicity<br>College Race | TBI | TWI | TOTAL | TBI | TWI | TOTAL | TBI | TWI | TOTAL | TBI | TWI | TOTAL |
| **Full-time Graduate** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non-Resident Alien | 2 | 306 | 308 | 3 | 433 | 436 | 22 | 646 | 668 | 24 | 981 | 1005 |
| 2 Black | 153 | 270 | 423 | 277 | 277 | 554 | 177 | 313 | 490 | 135 | 226 | 361 |
| 3 American Indian | 0 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 7 | 7 | 0 | 27 | 27 | 0 | 9 | 9 |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | 4 | 69 | 73 | 8 | 80 | 88 | 3 | 155 | 158 | 8 | 82 | 90 |
| 5 Hispanic | 0 | 18 | 18 | 0 | 26 | 26 | 1 | 58 | 59 | 1 | 39 | 40 |
| 6 White | 64 | 6514 | 6578 | 83 | 6518 | 6601 | 80 | 6971 | 7051 | 83 | 7027 | 7110 |
| TOTAL | 223 | 7183 | 7406 | 371 | 7291 | 7662 | 283 | 8170 | 8453 | 251 | 8364 | 8615 |
| **Part-time Graduate** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non-Resident Alien | 0 | 98 | 98 | 0 | 98 | 98 | 1 | 157 | 158 | 25 | 215 | 240 |
| 2 Black | 382 | 481 | 863 | 525 | 579 | 1104 | 358 | 848 | 1206 | 355 | 446 | 801 |
| 3 American Indian | 1 | 15 | 16 | 2 | 17 | 19 | 0 | 30 | 30 | 1 | 22 | 23 |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | 1 | 42 | 43 | 8 | 73 | 81 | 6 | 90 | 96 | 10 | 94 | 104 |
| 5 Hispanic | 2 | 23 | 25 | 3 | 36 | 39 | 3 | 64 | 67 | 0 | 49 | 49 |
| 6 White | 139 | 8364 | 8503 | 161 | 9239 | 9400 | 126 | 10654 | 10780 | 105 | 8052 | 8157 |
| TOTAL | 525 | 9023 | 9548 | 699 | 10042 | 10741 | 494 | 11843 | 12337 | 496 | 8878 | 9374 |
| **First Professional** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non-Resident Alien | 0 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 14 | 14 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 19 | 19 |
| 2 Black | 0 | 123 | 123 | 0 | 121 | 121 | 0 | 137 | 137 | 0 | 146 | 146 |
| 3 American Indian | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 8 |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | 0 | 18 | 18 | 0 | 29 | 29 | 0 | 52 | 52 | 0 | 85 | 85 |
| 5 Hispanic | 0 | 7 | 7 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 15 | 15 | 0 | 24 | 24 |
| 6 White | 0 | 2909 | 2909 | 0 | 2970 | 2970 | 0 | 3290 | 3290 | 0 | 3448 | 3448 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 3065 | 3065 | 0 | 3145 | 3145 | 0 | 3504 | 3504 | 0 | 3730 | 3730 |

Table 16

GRADUATE ENROLLMENT BY RACE/ETHNICITY IN TRADITIONALLY
BLACK AND WHITE ADAMS PUBLIC COLLEGES
1976-1982

| State: VIRGINIA<br>Year | 1976 | | | 1978 | | | 1980 | | | 1982 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Enrollment Status<br>Race/Ethnicity<br>College Race | TBI | TWI | TOTAL | TBI | TWI | TOTAL | TBI | TWI | TOTAL | TBI | TWI | TOTAL |
| **Full-time Graduate** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non-Resident Alien | .9 | 4.2 | 4.1 | .80 | 5.9 | 5.6 | 7.7 | 7.9 | 7.9 | 9.5 | 11.7 | 11.6 |
| 2 Black | 68.6 | 3.7 | 5.7 | 74.6 | 3.1 | 6.5 | 62.5 | 3.8 | 5.7 | 53.7 | 2.7 | 4.1 |
| 3 American Indian | | .08 | .08 | | .09 | .09 | | .33 | .31 | | .10 | .10 |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | 1.7 | .9 | .98 | 2.1 | 1.0 | 1.14 | 1.0 | 1.8 | 1.8 | 3.1 | .98 | 1.0 |
| 5 Hispanic | | .25 | .24 | | .35 | .33 | .35 | .70 | .69 | .39 | .46 | .46 |
| 6 White | 28.6 | 71.5 | 68.8 | 22.3 | 89.3 | 86.1 | 28.2 | 85.3 | 83.4 | 33.06 | 84.0 | 82.5 |
| TOTAL | 223 | 7,183 | 7,406 | 371 | 7,291 | 7,662 | 283 | 8,170 | 8,453 | 251 | 8364 | 8615 |
| **Part-time Graduate** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non-Resident Alien | | 1.08 | 1.02 | | .97 | .91 | .20 | 1.27 | 1.28 | 5.04 | 2.42 | 2.5 |
| 2 Black | 72.7 | 5.3 | 9.0 | 75.1 | 5.76 | 10.2 | 72.4 | 6.8 | 9.7 | 71.5 | 5.02 | 8.5 |
| 3 American Indian | .19 | .16 | .16 | .28 | .16 | .17 | | .24 | .24 | .20 | .24 | .24 |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | .19 | .46 | .45 | 1.1 | .72 | .75 | 1.2 | .72 | .77 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 1.1 |
| 5 Hispanic | .38 | .25 | .26 | .42 | .35 | .36 | .60 | .51 | .54 | | .55 | .52 |
| 6 White | 26.4 | 92.6 | 89.0 | 23.0 | 92.0 | 87.5 | 25.5 | 86.3 | 87.7 | 21.1 | 90.6 | 87.0 |
| TOTAL | 525 | 9,023 | 9,548 | 699 | 10,042 | 10,741 | 494 | 11,843 | 12,337 | 496 | 8,878 | 9,374 |
| **First Professional** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non-Resident Alien | | .26 | .26 | | .44 | .44 | | .22 | .22 | | .50 | .50 |
| 2 Black | | 4.0 | 4.0 | | 3.8 | 3.8 | | 3.9 | 3.9 | | 3.9 | 3.9 |
| 3 American Indian | | | | | .03 | .03 | | .05 | .05 | | .21 | .21 |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | | .58 | .58 | .9 | .92 | .92 | | 1.4 | 1.4 | | 2.2 | 2.2 |
| 5 Hispanic | | .22 | .22 | | .31 | .31 | | .42 | .42 | | .64 | .64 |
| 6 White | | 94.9 | 94.9 | | 94.4 | 94.4 | | 93.8 | 93.8 | | 92.4 | 92.4 |
| TOTAL | | 3,065 | 3,065 | | 3,145 | 3,145 | | 3504 | 3,504 | | 3730 | 3730 |

Table 17

DEGREE ATTAINMENT BY RACE/ETHNICITY IN TRADITIONALLY
BLACK AND WHITE ADAMS PUBLIC COLLEGES,
1975-76 TO 1980-81

| State ARKANSAS<br>Year | 1975-76 | | | 1976-77 | | | 1978-79 | | | 1980-81 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Degree Level<br>Race/Ethnicity<br>College Racial Heritage | TBI | TWI | TOTAL | TBI | TWI | TOTAL | TBI | TWI | TOTAL | TBI | TWI | TOTAL |
| Bachelors | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non Resident Alien | 3 | 9 | 12 | 5 | 11 | 16 | 16 | 26 | 42 | 22 | 40 | 62 |
| 2 Black | 281 | 325 | 606 | 313 | 292 | 605 | 341 | 352 | 693 | 315 | 395 | 710 |
| 3 American Indian | 0 | 13 | 13 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 11 | 11 | 0 | 13 | 13 |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | 0 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 13 | 13 | 0 | 35 | 35 | 0 | 12 | 12 |
| 5 Hispanic | 0 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 8 |
| 6 White | 26 | 4772 | 4798 | 24 | 4489 | 4513 | 28 | 4475 | 4503 | 15 | 4727 | 4742 |
| TOTAL | 310 | 5136 | 5446 | 342 | 4814 | 5156 | 385 | 4907 | 5292 | 352 | 5195 | 5547 |
| Masters | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non Resident Alien | 0 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 25 | 25 | 0 | 41 | 41 | 0 | 44 | 44 |
| 2 Black | 0 | 117 | 117 | 0 | 154 | 154 | 0 | 168 | 168 | 0 | 167 | 167 |
| 3 American Indian | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 14 | 14 |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | 0 | 11 | 11 | 0 | 19 | 19 | 0 | 30 | 30 | 0 | 8 | 8 |
| 5 Hispanic | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 7 | 0 | 11 | 11 | 0 | 6 | 6 |
| 6 White | 0 | 1416 | 1416 | 0 | 1507 | 1507 | 0 | 1365 | 1365 | 0 | 1484 | 1484 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 1562 | 1562 | 0 | 1718 | 1718 | 0 | 1620 | 1620 | 0 | 1723 | 1723 |
| Doctorate | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non Resident Alien | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 16 | 16 |
| 2 Black | 0 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| 3 American Indian | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | 0 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 Hispanic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6 White | 0 | 108 | 108 | 0 | 94 | 94 | 0 | 78 | 78 | 0 | 86 | 86 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 120 | 120 | 0 | 106 | 106 | 0 | 93 | 93 | 0 | 105 | 105 |
| Professional | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non Resident Alien | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 Black | 0 | 11 | 11 | 0 | 12 | 12 | 0 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 8 | 8 |
| 3 American Indian | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 5 Hispanic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 6 White | 0 | 288 | 288 | 0 | 313 | 313 | 0 | 360 | 360 | 0 | 380 | 380 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 299 | 299 | 0 | 327 | 327 | 0 | 379 | 379 | 0 | 391 | 391 |

Table 18

DEGREE ATTAINMENT BY RACE/ETHNICITY IN TRADITIONALLY
BLACK AND WHITE ADAMS PUBLIC COLLEGES,
1975-76 TO 1980-81

| State ARKANSAS<br>Year | 1975-76 | | | 1976-77 | | | 1978-79 | | | 1980-81 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Degree Level<br>Race/Ethnicity<br>College Racial Heritage | TBI | TWI | TOTAL | TBI | TWI | TOTAL | TBI | TWI | TOTAL | TBI | TWI | TOTAL |
| **Bachelors** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non Resident Alien | 1% | .2% | .2% | 1% | .2% | .3% | 4% | .5% | .8% | 6% | .8% | 1% |
| 2 Black | 91% | 6% | 11% | 92% | 6% | 12% | 89% | 7% | 13% | 89% | 8% | 13% |
| 3 American Indian | | .3% | .2 | | .1 | .09% | | .2% | .2% | | .3% | .2% |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | | .16% | .15% | | .3% | .3% | | .7% | .5% | | .2% | .2% |
| 5 Hispanic | | .18% | .17% | | .08% | .07% | | .2% | .2% | | .2% | .1% |
| 6 White | 8% | 93% | 86% | 7% | 93% | 88% | 7% | 91% | 85% | 4% | 91% | 85% |
| TOTAL | 310 | 5136 | 5446 | 342 | 4814 | 5156 | 385 | 4907 | 5292 | 352 | 5195 | 5547 |
| **Masters** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non Resident Alien | | .6% | .6 | | 1% | 1% | | 3% | 3% | | .3% | .3% |
| 2 Black | | 7% | 7% | | 9% | 9% | | 10% | 10% | | 1% | 1% |
| 3 American Indian | | .3% | .3% | | .3% | .3% | | .3% | .3% | | .8% | .8% |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | | 7% | 7% | | 1% | 1% | | 2% | 2% | | .5% | .5% |
| 5 Hispanic | | .3% | .3% | | .4% | .4% | | .7% | .7% | | .3% | .3% |
| 6 White | | 91% | 91% | | 88% | 88% | | 84% | 84% | | 86% | 86% |
| TOTAL | | 1562 | 1562 | | 1718 | 1718 | | 1620 | 1620 | | 1723 | 1723 |
| **Doctorate** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non Resident Alien | | .8% | .8% | | 4% | 4% | | 5% | 5% | | 15% | 15% |
| 2 Black | | 4% | 4% | | 3% | 3% | | 4% | 4% | | 3% | 3% |
| 3 American Indian | | .8% | .8% | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | | 4% | 4% | | 2% | 2% | | 5% | 5% | | | |
| 5 Hispanic | | | | | 3% | 3% | | 1% | 1% | | | |
| 6 White | | .9% | .9% | | 89% | 89% | | 84% | 84% | | 82% | 82% |
| TOTAL | | 120 | 120 | | 106 | 106 | | 93 | 93 | | 105 | 105 |
| **Professional** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non Resident Alien | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 Black | | 4% | 4% | | 4% | 4% | | 2% | 2% | | 2% | 2% |
| 3 American Indian | | | | | | | | 2% | 2% | | .2% | .2% |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | | | | | .6% | .6% | | .8% | .8% | | .2% | .2% |
| 5 Hispanic | | | | | | | | .3% | .3% | | .2% | .2% |
| 6 White | | 96% | 96% | | 96% | 96% | | 97% | 97% | | 97% | 97% |
| TOTAL | | 299 | 299 | | 327 | 327 | | 379 | 379 | | 391 | 391 |

Table 19

DEGREE ATTAINMENT BY RACE/ETHNICITY IN TRADITIONALLY
BLACK AND WHITE ADAMS PUBLIC COLLEGES,
1975-76 TO 1980-81

| State FLORIDA / Year | 1975-76 | | | 1976-77 | | | 1978-79 | | | 1980-81 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Degree Level / Race/Ethnicity / College Racial Heritage | TBI | TWI | TOTAL | TBI | TWI | TOTAL | TBI | TWI | TOTAL | TBI | TWI | TOTAL |
| **Bachelors** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non Resident Alien | 1 | 154 | 155 | 0 | 299 | 299 | 0 | 191 | 191 | 22 | 427 | 449 |
| 2 Black | 558 | 754 | 1312 | 620 | 853 | 1473 | 615 | 1036 | 1651 | 587 | 1044 | 1631 |
| 3 American Indian | 25 | 43 | 68 | 0 | 39 | 39 | 0 | 23 | 23 | 0 | 19 | 19 |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | 1 | 71 | 72 | 7 | 81 | 88 | 9 | 158 | 167 | 9 | 212 | 221 |
| 5 Hispanic | 4 | 721 | 725 | 1 | 760 | 761 | 3 | 1005 | 1008 | 1 | 1086 | 1087 |
| 6 White | 23 | 18024 | 18047 | 55 | 17850 | 17905 | 85 | 17094 | 17179 | 59 | 17552 | 17611 |
| TOTAL | 612 | 19767 | 20379 | 683 | 19882 | 20565 | 712 | 19507 | 20219 | 678 | 20340 | 21018 |
| **Masters** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non Resident Alien | 0 | 115 | 115 | 0 | 231 | 231 | 0 | 225 | 225 | 0 | 270 | 270 |
| 2 Black | 193 | 280 | 473 | 177 | 342 | 519 | 145 | 236 | 381 | 46 | 228 | 274 |
| 3 American Indian | 0 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 8 | 8 |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | 0 | 39 | 39 | 2 | 31 | 33 | 4 | 44 | 48 | 1 | 46 | 47 |
| 5 Hispanic | 1 | 154 | 155 | 1 | 169 | 170 | 0 | 139 | 139 | 0 | 157 | 157 |
| 6 White | 23 | 5279 | 5302 | 23 | 4950 | 4973 | 27 | 4479 | 4506 | 7 | 4304 | 4311 |
| TOTAL | 217 | 5876 | 6093 | 203 | 5731 | 5934 | 176 | 5128 | 5304 | 54 | 5013 | 5067 |
| **Doctorate** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non Resident Alien | 0 | 43 | 43 | 0 | 89 | 89 | 0 | 89 | 89 | 0 | 73 | 73 |
| 2 Black | 0 | 36 | 36 | 0 | 41 | 41 | 0 | 28 | 28 | 0 | 38 | 38 |
| 3 American Indian | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | 0 | 19 | 19 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 12 | 12 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| 5 Hispanic | 0 | 13 | 13 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 14 | 14 | 0 | 12 | 12 |
| 6 White | 0 | 580 | 580 | 0 | 550 | 550 | 0 | 568 | 568 | 0 | 570 | 570 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 693 | 693 | 0 | 695 | 695 | 0 | 713 | 713 | 0 | 697 | 697 |
| **Professional** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non Resident Alien | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| 2 Black | 0 | 34 | 34 | 0 | 33 | 33 | 0 | 36 | 36 | 0 | 34 | 34 |
| 3 American Indian | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| 5 Hispanic | 0 | 11 | 11 | 0 | 14 | 14 | 0 | 44 | 44 | 0 | 33 | 33 |
| 6 White | 0 | 626 | 626 | 0 | 672 | 672 | 0 | 663 | 663 | 0 | 848 | 848 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 674 | 674 | 0 | 724 | 724 | 0 | 751 | 751 | 0 | 921 | 921 |

Table 20

PERCENTAGES
DEGREE ATTAINMENT BY RACE/ETHNICITY IN TRADITIONALLY
BLACK AND WHITE ADAMS PUBLIC COLLEGES,
1975-76 TO 1980-81

| State FLORIDA / Year | 1975-76 | | | 1976-77 | | | 1978-79 | | | 1980-81 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Degree Level / Race/Ethnicity / College Racial Heritage | TBI | TWI | TOTAL | TBI | TWI | TOTAL | TBI | TWI | TOTAL | TBI | TWI | TOTAL |
| Bachelors | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non Resident Alien | .2% | .8% | .8% | 0% | 2% | 2% | 0% | .9% | .9% | 3% | 2% | 2% |
| 2 Black | 91% | 4% | 6% | 91% | 4% | 6% | 86% | 8% | 8% | 87% | 5% | 8% |
| 3 American Indian | 4% | .2% | .3% | 0% | .2% | .2% | 0% | .1% | 0% | 0% | .09% | .09% |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | .2% | .4% | .4% | 1% | .4% | .4% | 1% | .8% | .8% | 1% | 1% | 1% |
| 5 Hispanic | .2% | .3% | .4% | .1% | .4% | .4% | .4% | .5% | .5% | .1% | .5% | .5% |
| 6 White | 4% | 91% | 89% | 8% | 90% | 87% | 12% | 85% | 88% | 9% | 86% | 84% |
| TOTAL | 612 | 19,767 | 20,379 | 683 | 19,882 | 20,565 | 712 | 19,507 | 20,219 | 628 | 20340 | 21,018 |
| Masters | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non Resident Alien | 0% | 2% | 2% | 0% | 4% | 4% | 0% | 4% | 4% | 0% | 5% | 5% |
| 2 Black | 89% | 5% | 8% | 87% | 6% | 7% | 82% | 5% | 7% | 85% | 5% | 5% |
| 3 American Indian | 0% | 2% | .1% | 0% | .1% | .1% | 0% | .09% | .09% | 0% | .2% | .2% |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | 0% | .7% | .6% | 1% | .5% | .6% | 2% | .9% | .9% | .2% | .9% | .9% |
| 5 Hispanic | .5% | .1% | .1% | .5% | .3% | .3% | 0% | .3% | .3% | 0% | .3% | .3% |
| 6 White | 11% | 90% | 87% | 11% | 86% | 84% | 15% | 87% | 85% | 13% | 86% | 85% |
| TOTAL | 217 | 5876 | 6093 | 203 | 5731 | 5934 | 176 | 5128 | 5304 | 54 | 5013 | 5067 |
| Doctorate | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non Resident Alien | | 6% | 6% | | 13% | 13% | | 12% | 12% | | 10% | 10% |
| 2 Black | | 5% | 5% | | 6% | 6% | | 4% | 4% | | 5% | 5% |
| 3 American Indian | | .3% | .3% | | .3% | .3% | | .3% | .3% | | .3% | .3% |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | | 3% | 3% | | .4% | .4% | | 2% | 2% | | .3% | .3% |
| 5 Hispanic | | 2% | 2% | | 1% | 1% | | .1% | .1% | | 2% | 2% |
| 6 White | | 84% | 84% | | 79% | 79% | | 80% | 80% | | 82% | 82% |
| TOTAL | | 693 | 693 | | 695 | 695 | | 713 | 713 | | 697 | 697 |
| Professional | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non Resident Alien | | .3% | .3% | 0% | .6% | .6% | 0% | 0% | 0% | | .3% | .3% |
| 2 Black | | 5% | 5% | | 5% | 5% | | 5% | 5% | | 4% | 4% |
| 3 American Indian | | 1% | 1% | | .1% | .1% | | .3% | .3% | | .3% | .3% |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | | 0% | 0% | | 0% | 0% | | .8% | .8% | | .3% | .3% |
| 5 Hispanic | | 2% | 2% | | 2% | 2% | | 6% | 6% | | 4% | 4% |
| 6 White | | 93% | 93% | | 93% | 93% | | 88% | 88% | | 92% | 92% |
| TOTAL | | 674 | 674 | | 724 | 724 | | 751 | 751 | | 921 | 921 |

Table 21

DEGREE ATTAINMENT BY RACE/ETHNICITY IN TRADITIONALLY
BLACK AND WHITE ADAMS PUBLIC COLLEGES,
1975-76 TO 1980-81

| State GEORGIA<br>Year | 1975-76 | | | 1976-77 | | | 1978-79 | | | 1980-81 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Degree Level<br>Race/Ethnicity<br>College Racial Heritage | TBI | TWI | TOTAL | TBI | TWI | TOTAL | TBI | TWI | TOTAL | TBI | TWI | TOTAL |
| **Bachelors** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non Resident Alien | 2 | 60 | 62 | 5 | 28 | 33 | 30 | 160 | 190 | 18 | 249 | 267 |
| 2 Black | 743 | 562 | 1305 | 654 | 572 | 1226 | 536 | 672 | 1208 | 472 | 733 | 1205 |
| 3 American Indian | 1 | 16 | 17 | 0 | 17 | 17 | 0 | 16 | 16 | 0 | 22 | 22 |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | 3 | 36 | 39 | 0 | 45 | 45 | 1 | 46 | 47 | 0 | 69 | 69 |
| 5 Hispanic | 0 | 35 | 35 | 0 | 52 | 52 | 0 | 49 | 49 | 1 | 71 | 72 |
| 6 White | 16 | 11663 | 11679 | 23 | 11184 | 11207 | 17 | 10621 | 10638 | 38 | 11011 | 11049 |
| TOTAL | 765 | 12372 | 13137 | 682 | 11898 | 12580 | 584 | 11564 | 12148 | 529 | 12155 | 12684 |
| **Masters** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non Resident Alien | 0 | 23 | 23 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 248 | 250 | 8 | 328 | 336 |
| 2 Black | 61 | 709 | 770 | 125 | 674 | 799 | 66 | 541 | 601 | 33 | 362 | 395 |
| 3 American Indian | 0 | 13 | 13 | 0 | 13 | 13 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | 0 | 46 | 46 | 0 | 21 | 21 | 0 | 33 | 33 | 0 | 17 | 17 |
| 5 Hispanic | 0 | 14 | 14 | 0 | 16 | 16 | 0 | 15 | 15 | 0 | 24 | 24 |
| 6 White | 1 | 6232 | 6233 | 62 | 6300 | 6362 | 76 | 5172 | 5248 | 15 | 4565 | 4580 |
| TOTAL | 62 | 7037 | 7099 | 190 | 7027 | 7217 | 144 | 6015 | 6159 | 56 | 5299 | 5355 |
| **Doctorate** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non Resident Alien | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 53 | 0 | 57 | 57 |
| 2 Black | 0 | 18 | 18 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 20 | 20 | 0 | 20 | 20 |
| 3 American Indian | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| 5 Hispanic | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 6 White | 0 | 415 | 415 | 0 | 422 | 422 | 0 | 332 | 332 | 0 | 355 | 355 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 445 | 445 | 0 | 440 | 440 | 0 | 413 | 413 | 0 | 436 | 436 |
| **Professional** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non Resident Alien | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 2 Black | 0 | 17 | 17 | 0 | 17 | 17 | 0 | 20 | 20 | 0 | 22 | 22 |
| 3 American Indian | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | 0 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| 5 Hispanic | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 6 |
| 6 White | 0 | 507 | 507 | 0 | 459 | 459 | 0 | 479 | 479 | 0 | 500 | 500 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 530 | 530 | 0 | 483 | 483 | 0 | 501 | 501 | 0 | 533 | 533 |

Table 22

DEGREE ATTAINMENT BY RACE/ETHNICITY IN TRADITIONALLY BLACK AND WHITE ADAMS PUBLIC COLLEGES, 1975-76 TO 1980-81

| State GEORGIA / Year | 1975-76 | | | 1976-77 | | | 1978-79 | | | 1980-81 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Degree Level / Race/Ethnicity / College Racial Heritage | TBI | TWI | TOTAL | TBI | TWI | TOTAL | TBI | TWI | TOTAL | TBI | TWI | TOTAL |
| Bachelors | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non Resident Alien | .3 | .5 | .5 | 1 | .2 | .2 | 5 | 1.3 | 1.5 | 3.4 | 2 | 2 |
| 2 Black | 97.1 | 4.5 | 10 | 96 | 5 | 10 | 92 | 6 | 10 | 89.2 | 6 | 10 |
| 3 American Indian | .1 | .1 | .1 | | .1 | .1 | .1 | .1 | .1 | | .1 | .1 |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | .4 | .3 | .3 | | .3 | .3 | .1 | .3 | .3 | .2 | .5 | .5 |
| 5 Hispanic | | .3 | .3 | | .4 | .4 | | .4 | .4 | .2 | .5 | .5 |
| 6 White | 2.1 | 94.3 | 89 | 3 | 94 | 89 | 2.9 | 92 | 88 | 7.2 | 91 | 87 |
| TOTAL | 765 | 12372 | 13,137 | 682 | 11898 | 12,580 | 584 | 11564 | 12148 | 529 | 12155 | 12684 |
| Masters | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non Resident Alien | | .3 | .3 | 1 | | | 1 | 4.1 | 4 | 14 | 6.2 | 6 |
| 2 Black | 98 | 10 | 11 | 66 | 9.5 | 11 | 46 | 9 | 10 | 59 | 7 | 7.3 |
| 3 American Indian | .1 | .1 | .1 | | .1 | .2 | | | | | | |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | | .6 | .6 | | .2 | .3 | | .5 | .5 | | .3 | .3 |
| 5 Hispanic | | .1 | .1 | | .2 | .2 | | .2 | .2 | | .4 | .4 |
| 6 White | 2 | 89 | 88 | 33 | 90 | 88 | 53 | 86 | 85.2 | 27 | 86 | 86 |
| TOTAL | 62 | 7037 | 7099 | 190 | 7027 | 7217 | 144 | 6015 | 6159 | 56 | 5299 | 5355 |
| Doctorate | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non Resident Alien | | .4 | .4 | | | | | 13 | 13 | | 13 | 13 |
| 2 Black | | 4 | 4 | | 2.3 | 2.3 | | 5 | 5 | | 5 | 5 |
| 3 American Indian | | .4 | .4 | | .2 | .2 | | .5 | .5 | | | |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | | .9 | .9 | | 1.3 | 1.3 | | 1.2 | 1.2 | | .7 | .7 |
| 5 Hispanic | | .9 | .9 | | .2 | .2 | | .2 | .2 | | .2 | .2 |
| 6 White | | 93.3 | 93.3 | | 96 | 96 | | 80 | 80 | | 81 | 81 |
| TOTAL | | 445 | 445 | | 440 | 440 | | 413 | 413 | | 436 | 436 |
| Professional | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non Resident Alien | | | | | | | | | | | .2 | .2 |
| 2 Black | | 3.2 | 3.2 | | 3.5 | 3.5 | | 4 | 4 | | 4 | 4 |
| 3 American Indian | | | | | .6 | .6 | | | | | .2 | .2 |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | | 1 | 1 | | .4 | .4 | | | | | .6 | .6 |
| 5 Hispanic | | .2 | .2 | | .4 | .4 | | .4 | .4 | | 1 | 1 |
| 6 White | | 95.6 | 95.6 | | 95 | 95 | | 95.6 | 95.6 | | 94 | 94 |
| TOTAL | | 530 | 530 | | 483 | 483 | | 501 | 501 | | 533 | 533 |

Table 23

DEGREE ATTAINMENT BY RACE/ETHNICITY IN TRADITIONALLY BLACK AND WHITE ADAMS PUBLIC COLLEGES, 1975-76 TO 1980-81

| State OKLAHOMA / Year | 1975-76 | | | 1976-77 | | | 1978-79 | | | 1980-81 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Degree Level / Race/Ethnicity / College Racial Heritage | TBI | TWI | TOTAL | TBI | TWI | TOTAL | TBI | TWI | TOTAL | TBI | TWI | TOTAL |
| **Bachelors** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non Resident Alien | 5 | 232 | 237 | 1 | 257 | 258 | 7 | 368 | 375 | 42 | 617 | 659 |
| 2 Black | 163 | 355 | 518 | 176 | 323 | 499 | 77 | 356 | 433 | 65 | 380 | 445 |
| 3 American Indian | 0 | 274 | 274 | 0 | 259 | 259 | 0 | 325 | 325 | 0 | 301 | 301 |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | 0 | 43 | 43 | 0 | 48 | 48 | 0 | 62 | 62 | 0 | 93 | 93 |
| 5 Hispanic | 0 | 38 | 38 | 0 | 31 | 31 | 0 | 61 | 61 | 0 | 72 | 72 |
| 6 White | 0 | 9633 | 9633 | 1 | 9095 | 9096 | 0 | 9037 | 9037 | 14 | 8939 | 8953 |
| TOTAL | 168 | 10575 | 10743 | 178 | 10013 | 10191 | 84 | 10209 | 10293 | 121 | 10402 | 10523 |
| **Masters** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non Resident Alien | 0 | 311 | 311 | 0 | 404 | 404 | 0 | 417 | 417 | 0 | 427 | 427 |
| 2 Black | 0 | 124 | 124 | 0 | 126 | 126 | 0 | 131 | 131 | 0 | 102 | 102 |
| 3 American Indian | 0 | 83 | 83 | 0 | 56 | 56 | 0 | 90 | 90 | 0 | 77 | 77 |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | 0 | 31 | 31 | 0 | 23 | 23 | 0 | 17 | 17 | 0 | 31 | 31 |
| 5 Hispanic | 0 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 7 | 7 | 0 | 15 | 15 | 0 | 30 | 30 |
| 6 White | 0 | 3060 | 3060 | 0 | 2908 | 2908 | 0 | 2491 | 2491 | 0 | 2371 | 2371 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 3618 | 3618 | 0 | 3524 | 3524 | 0 | 3089 | 3089 | 0 | 3038 | 3038 |
| **Doctorate** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non Resident Alien | 0 | 45 | 45 | 0 | 49 | 49 | 0 | 63 | 63 | 0 | 80 | 80 |
| 2 Black | 0 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 22 | 22 | 0 | 11 | 11 |
| 3 American Indian | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 8 | 8 |
| 5 Hispanic | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| 6 White | 0 | 335 | 335 | 0 | 307 | 307 | 0 | 300 | 300 | 0 | 247 | 247 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 395 | 395 | 0 | 373 | 373 | 0 | 395 | 395 | 0 | 353 | 353 |
| **Professional** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non Resident Alien | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 |
| 2 Black | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 8 | 8 |
| 3 American Indian | 0 | 12 | 12 | 0 | 12 | 12 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 4 |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 9 | 9 |
| 5 Hispanic | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 15 | 15 | 0 | 11 | 11 |
| 6 White | 0 | 376 | 376 | 0 | 394 | 394 | 0 | 480 | 480 | 0 | 533 | 533 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 395 | 395 | 0 | 414 | 414 | 0 | 504 | 504 | 0 | 571 | 571 |

Table 24

DEGREE ATTAINMENT BY RACE/ETHNICITY IN TRADITIONALLY
BLACK AND WHITE ADAMS PUBLIC COLLEGES,
1975-76 TO 1980-81

| State OKLAHOMA<br>Year | 1975-76 | | | 1976-77 | | | 1978-79 | | | 1980-81 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Degree Level<br>Race/Ethnicity<br>College Racial Heritage | TBI | TWI | TOTAL | TBI | TWI | TOTAL | TBI | TWI | TOTAL | TBI | TWI | TOTAL |
| **Bachelors** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non Resident Alien | 3 | 2 | 2 | .5 | 2 | 2.5 | 8 | 4 | 3 | 35 | 6 | 6 |
| 2 Black | 97 | 3 | 5 | 99 | 3 | 5 | 92 | 3 | 4 | 54 | 4 | 4 |
| 3 American Indian | | 3 | 3 | | 3 | 2.5 | | 3 | 3 | | 3 | 3 |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | | .4 | .3 | | .5 | .5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | .8 | 1 |
| 5 Hispanic | 1 | .4 | .3 | | .3 | .3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | .6 | 1 |
| 6 White | | 91 | 89.6 | .5 | 91 | 89.2 | | 88 | 88 | 11 | 86 | 85 |
| TOTAL | 168 | 10,575 | 10,743 | 178 | 10,013 | 10,191 | 84 | 10,209 | 10,293 | 121 | 10,402 | 10,523 |
| **Masters** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non Resident Alien | | 9 | 9 | | 11 | 11 | | 13 | 13 | | 14 | 14 |
| 2 Black | | 3 | 3 | | 4 | 4 | | 4 | 4 | | 3 | 3 |
| 3 American Indian | | 2 | 2 | | 2 | 2 | | 3 | 3 | | 3 | 3 |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | .5 | .5 | | 1 | 1 |
| 5 Hispanic | | .2 | .2 | | .2 | .2 | | .5 | .5 | | 1 | 1 |
| 6 White | | 85 | 85 | | 82 | 82 | | 80 | 80 | | 78 | 78 |
| TOTAL | | 3618 | 3618 | | 3524 | 3524 | | 3089 | 3089 | | 3038 | 3038 |
| **Doctorate** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non Resident Alien | | 11 | 11 | | 13 | 13 | | 16 | 16 | | 23 | 23 |
| 2 Black | | 2 | 2 | | 2 | 2 | | 6 | 6 | | 3 | 3 |
| 3 American Indian | | .8 | .8 | | 1 | 1 | | .7 | .7 | | 1 | 1 |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | | .3 | .3 | | .5 | .5 | | 1 | 1 | | 2 | 2 |
| 5 Hispanic | | .8 | .8 | | 1 | 1 | | .5 | .5 | | .5 | .5 |
| 6 White | | 85 | 85 | | 82.3 | 82.3 | | 76 | 76 | | 70 | 70 |
| TOTAL | | 395 | 395 | | 373 | 373 | | 395 | 395 | | 353 | 353 |
| **Professional** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non Resident Alien | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| 2 Black | | .3 | .3 | | .2 | .2 | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 |
| 3 American Indian | | 3 | 3 | | 3 | 3 | | .4 | .4 | | 1 | 1 |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | | .5 | .5 | | .5 | .5 | | .4 | .4 | | 2 | 2 |
| 5 Hispanic | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | 3 | 3 | | 2 | 2 |
| 6 White | | 95 | 95 | | 95 | 95 | | 95.2 | 95.2 | | 93 | 93 |
| TOTAL | | 395 | 395 | | 414 | 414 | | 504 | 504 | | 571 | 571 |

Table 25

DEGREE ATTAINMENT BY RACE/ETHNICITY IN TRADITIONALLY
BLACK AND WHITE ADAMS PUBLIC COLLEGES,
1975-76 TO 1980-81

| State VIRGINIA<br>Year | 1975-76 | | | 1976-77 | | | 1978-79 | | | 1980-81 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Degree Level<br>Race/Ethnicity<br>College Racial Heritage | TBI | TWI | TOTAL | TBI | TWI | TOTAL | TBI | TWI | TOTAL | TBI | TWI | TOTAL |
| **Bachelors** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non Resident Alien | 0 | 59 | 59 | 35 | 74 | 109 | 19 | 86 | 105 | 43 | 106 | 149 |
| 2 Black | 1272 | 366 | 1638 | 1211 | 422 | 1633 | 1196 | 527 | 1723 | 949 | 679 | 1628 |
| 3 American Indian | 1 | 20 | 21 | 0 | 21 | 21 | 0 | 20 | 20 | 1 | 25 | 26 |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | 8 | 58 | 66 | 15 | 55 | 70 | 1 | 104 | 105 | 1 | 129 | 130 |
| 5 Hispanic | 0 | 55 | 55 | 0 | 89 | 89 | 0 | 79 | 79 | 1 | 75 | 76 |
| 6 White | 73 | 13560 | 13633 | 71 | 13639 | 13710 | 33 | 14646 | 14679 | 29 | | 15104 |
| TOTAL | 1354 | 14118 | 15472 | 1332 | 14300 | 15632 | 1249 | 15462 | 16711 | 1024 | 16089 | 17113 |
| **Masters** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non Resident Alien | 0 | 67 | 67 | 4 | 84 | 88 | 1 | 136 | 137 | 14 | 193 | 207 |
| 2 Black | 189 | 178 | 367 | 194 | 226 | 420 | 195 | 213 | 408 | 149 | 244 | 393 |
| 3 American Indian | 0 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 9 | 10 |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | 2 | 32 | 34 | 8 | 22 | 30 | 1 | 40 | 41 | 2 | 25 | 27 |
| 5 Hispanic | 0 | 15 | 15 | 0 | 16 | 16 | 10 | 18 | 28 | 1 | 16 | 17 |
| 6 White | 104 | 4220 | 4324 | 103 | 4225 | 4328 | 50 | 4135 | 4185 | 68 | 4411 | 4479 |
| TOTAL | 295 | 4520 | 4815 | 309 | 4581 | 4890 | 257 | 4544 | 4801 | 235 | 4898 | 5133 |
| **Doctorate** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non Resident Alien | 0 | 16 | 16 | 0 | 29 | 29 | 0 | 40 | 40 | 0 | 58 | 58 |
| 2 Black | 0 | 19 | 19 | 0 | 18 | 18 | 0 | 27 | 27 | 0 | 19 | 19 |
| 3 American Indian | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | 0 | 7 | 7 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 5 Hispanic | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6 White | 0 | 432 | 432 | 0 | 414 | 414 | 0 | 422 | 422 | 0 | 450 | 450 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 475 | 475 | 0 | 467 | 467 | 0 | 499 | 499 | 0 | 529 | 529 |
| **Professional** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non Resident Alien | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 2 Black | 0 | 23 | 23 | 0 | 30 | 30 | 0 | 29 | 29 | 0 | 42 | 42 |
| 3 American Indian | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 8 | 8 |
| 5 Hispanic | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 4 |
| 6 White | 0 | 824 | 824 | 0 | 808 | 808 | 0 | 850 | 850 | 0 | 1231 | 1231 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 850 | 850 | 0 | 843 | 843 | 0 | 894 | 894 | 0 | 1288 | 1288 |

Table 26

DEGREE ATTAINMENT BY RACE/ETHNICITY IN TRADITIONALLY
BLACK AND WHITE ADAMS PUBLIC COLLEGES,
1975-76 TO 1980-81

| State VIRGINIA<br>Year | 1975-76 | | | 1976-77 | | | 1978-79 | | | 1980-81 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Degree Level<br>Race/Ethnicity<br>College Racial Heritage | TBI | TWI | TOTAL | TBI | TWI | TOTAL | TBI | TWI | TOTAL | TBI | TWI | TOTAL |
| **Bachelors** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non Resident Alien | | .4% | .4% | 2.6% | .5% | .7% | 1.5% | .6% | .6% | 4.2% | .7% | .9% |
| 2 Black | 93.9 | 2.6 | 10.6 | 90.9 | 3.0 | 10.4 | 95.8 | 3.4 | 10.3 | 92.7 | 4.2 | 9.5 |
| 3 American Indian | .1 | .1 | .1 | | .1 | .1 | | .1 | .1 | .1 | .2 | .2 |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | .6 | .4 | .4 | 1.1 | .4 | .4 | .1 | .7 | .6 | .1 | .8 | .8 |
| 5 Hispanic | | .4 | .4 | | .6 | .6 | | .5 | .5 | .1 | .5 | .4 |
| 6 White | 5.4 | 96.0 | 88.1 | 5.3 | 95.4 | 87.7 | 2.6 | 94.7 | 87.8 | 2.8 | 93.7 | 88.3 |
| TOTAL | 1,354 | 14,118 | 15,472 | 1,332 | 14,300 | 15,632 | 1,249 | 15,462 | 16,711 | 1,024 | 16,089 | 17,113 |
| **Masters** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non Resident Alien | | 1.5% | 1.4% | 1.3% | 1.8% | 1.8% | .4% | 3.0% | 2.9% | 6.0% | 3.9% | 4.0% |
| 2 Black | 64.1 | 3.9 | 7.6 | 62.8 | 4.9 | 8.6 | 75.9 | 4.7 | 8.5 | 63.4 | 5.0 | 7.7 |
| 3 American Indian | | .2 | .2 | | .2 | .2 | | | | .4 | .2 | .2 |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | .7 | .7 | .7 | 2.6 | .5 | .6 | .4 | .9 | .9 | .9 | .5 | .5 |
| 5 Hispanic | | .3 | .3 | | .3 | .3 | 3.9 | .4 | .6 | .4 | .3 | .3 |
| 6 White | 35.3 | 93.4 | 89.8 | 33.3 | 42.2 | 88.5 | 19.5 | 91.0 | 87.2 | 28.9 | 90.1 | 87.3 |
| TOTAL | 294 | 4,520 | 4,815 | 309 | 4,581 | 4,890 | 257 | 4,544 | 4,801 | 235 | 4,898 | 5,133 |
| **Doctorate** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non Resident Alien | | 3.4% | 3.4% | | 6.2% | 6.2% | | 8.0% | 8.0% | | 11.0% | 11.0% |
| 2 Black | | 4.0 | 4.0 | | 3.9 | 3.9 | | 5.4 | 5.4 | | 3.6 | 3.6 |
| 3 American Indian | | | | | | | | | | | .2 | .2 |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | | 1.5 | 1.5 | | 1.1 | 1.1 | | 2.0 | 2.0 | | .2 | .2 |
| 5 Hispanic | | .2 | .2 | | .2 | .2 | | | | | | |
| 6 White | | 90.9 | 90.9 | | 88.7 | 88.7 | | 84.6 | 84.6 | | 85.1 | 85.1 |
| TOTAL | | 475 | 475 | | 467 | 467 | | 499 | 499 | | 529 | 529 |
| **Professional** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Non Resident Alien | | | | | .1% | .1% | | | | | .1% | .1% |
| 2 Black | | 2.7 | 2.7 | | 3.6 | 3.6 | | 3.2 | 3.2 | | 3.3 | 3.3 |
| 3 American Indian | | | | | | | | | | | .2 | .2 |
| 4 Asian Pacific Isl. | | .1 | .1 | | .4 | .4 | | .6 | .6 | | .6 | .6 |
| 5 Hispanic | | .2 | .2 | | .1 | .1 | | .4 | .4 | | .3 | .3 |
| 6 White | | 96.9 | 96.9 | | 95.8 | 95.8 | | 95.1 | 95.1 | | 95.6 | 95.6 |
| TOTAL | | 850 | 850 | | 843 | 843 | | 894 | 894 | | 1,288 | 1,288 |

Appendix E

The *Adams* Case: An Annotated Chronology

The Adams Case: An Annotated Chronology

January 1969

HEW concludes that ten southern and border states were operating and maintaining dual systems of higher education in violation of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

October 1970

A class action omnibus suit attacking federal support of segregated public schools as colleges and universities is filed against HEW by attorneys for the NAACP Legal Defense Fund in behalf of all federal taxpayers. The suit , known as Adams v. Richardson, is filed in U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, Judge John H. Pratt presiding.

June 1971

Judge Pratt denies HEW's motion for dismissal of the suit.

February 1973

Judge Pratt finds that HEW had failed to execute its responsibilities under Title VI and that time permitted for voluntary compliance had "long since passed." HEW appeals the decision.

April 1973

United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia considers HEW's appeal. Before the court is an amicus curaie brief, filed by the National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education

(NAFEO), stating that black colleges should not bear the full brunt of any desegregation effort.

June 1973

Judge Pratt's decision is unanimously affirmed (per curiam) by the appeals court. The appeals court in its opinion notes the significant contributions of black colleges. The appeals court gives HEW until June 1974 as the deadline for receiving acceptable plans.

November 1973

HEW provides criteria for states to follow in revising their plans.

June 1974

HEW receives nine final desegregation plans. Louisiana refuses to respond, and the Justice Department files suit against Louisiana. The Office for Civil Rights (OCR) of HEW accepts eight of the nine plans. Mississippi's plan is partially accepted and, thus, referred to the Justice Department for legal action.

August 1975

LDF files a motion for further relief in Judge Pratt's court alleging that HEW by accepting inadequate plans for desegregation of eight statewide systems had not fulfilled obligations of the court order.

September 1975

The Justice Department files a motion on behalf of HEW, claiming LDF's motion is improper because HEW has properly exercised its discretion under Title VI.

December 1975

The Director of OCR notifies Maryland's Governor Mandel that enforcement action is being initiated against the state's system of higher education for failure to implement its plan to desegregate its higher education system. Maryland then sues HEW and wins an injunction. HEW appeals to Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals, Richmond, Virginia.

March 1976

NAFEO files an annexed amicus brief opposing LDF's motion for further relief.

April 1976

Pennsylvania intervenes as a party defendant in the Adams case. The state claims that HEW is not adequately representing its interest.

Janury 1977

The deposition of former OCR Director Martin Gerry admits in U.S. District Court in the District of Columbia that HEW was derelict in its duty to seek effective desegregation plans. Judge Pratt grants LDF's motion with regard to six states' systems: Virginia, Arkansas, Oklahoma, Georgia, Florida, North Carolina.

April 1977

Judge Pratt issues a supplemental order requiring HEW to draw up new guidelines for the six states to follow in submitting their statewide plans for desegregation. Judge Pratt also releases along with his order an annexed statement filed by NAFEO as a policy guide for preparing new desegregation guides. The final decision directs that the new criteria not overlook the special educational needs of blacks and black colleges, nor should a disproportionate share of the implementation be placed upon public black colleges.

July 1977

HEW's new criteria are submitted to Judge Pratt. These are criteria that the six states must follow.

August 1977

Amended criteria appear in The Federal Register, August 11, 1977. Amendments state 1981-82 as the date for complete implementation. Mandel vs. HEW decided by Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals. Court directs HEW to submit new guidelines for Maryland's desegregation plan to follow. The court halts HEW from initiating enforcement proceedings against Maryland.

January 1978

All plans should be submitted and approved by HEW at this date.

1981 - 1982

All statewide desegregation plans should be implemented.

## Authors' Biography

William T. Trent is an Assistant Professor of Educational Policy Studies/Sociology at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. He received the Ph.D. in sociology from the University of North Carolina at Chapel HIll. Before joining the faculty at the University of Illinois, he was a Research Fellow at the Johns Hopkins University Center for Social Organization of Schools. Prior to going to Johns Hopkins he was a research associate at the Center for Educational Policy Studies and Public Affairs, Duke University. His research focuses on the education of minorities. His recent publications include:

"Equity Considerations in Higher Education: Race and Sex Differences in Degree Attainment and Major Field from 1976 through 1981." American Journal of Education, May 1984.

"Sociology of Education: A Focus on Education as an Institution" with R.H. Braddock and R. Henderson. Review of Research in Education, V. 12, 1985.

Elaine J. Copeland is Associate Dean of the Graduate College and Assistant Professor in the Department of Educational Psychology at the University of Illinois. She received a Ph.D. in Counseling from Oregon State University where she was a psychological counselor involved in coordinating counseling programs for minority students. In her position at Illinois she is concerned with increasing access of underrepresented minority students to graduate study. Her

research interests include cross-cultural counseling and educational policy related to minorities in higher education. Recent publications include:

Trends in Black Participation in Graduate Education Proceeding, The Second National Conference on Issues Facing Black Administrators at Predominantly White Colleges and Universities, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1984.

Effective Counseling of Minority Students, American Speech and Hearing Association Reports, V. 16, Chapter 3, 12-16, 1987.

## PUBLICATIONS OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION PROGRAM RESEARCH SERIES

- *A Study of Title III Impact on Historically Black Institutions,*
  (Dr. Cameron Fincher, Institute of Higher Education, University of Georgia, Athens)

- *Recent College and University Enrollment Patterns of Black Students in States Affected By ADAMS-CALIFANO Litigation,*
  (Dr. William Brazziel, University of Connecticut, and Marian Brazziel, Mansfield Center, Connecticut)

- *Access, Retention and Progression of Black Students Through the Two-Tier Florida Higher Education System,*
  (Dr. Charles Grigg, Florida State University, Institute of Social Research)

- *Black Employees in Traditionally White Institutions in the ADAMS States: 1975 to 1977,*
  (Dr. Anne S. Pruitt, Ohio State University)

- *Determining the College Destination of Black Students,*
  (Dr. Gail E. Thomas and Dr. Jomills Henry Braddock II, Center for Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University)

- *Factors Related to the Postbaccalaureate Careers of Black Graduates of Selected Four-Year Institutions in Alabama,*
  (Dr. Rhoda B. Johnson, Tuskegee University)

- *Coping Strategies: Retaining Black Students in College*
  (Dr. Yvonne Abatso, Langston Urban Center, Tulsa, Oklahoma)

- *Networking and Mentoring: A Study of Cross-Generational Experiences of Blacks in Graduate and Professional Schools,*
  (Dr. James E. Blackwell, University of Massachusetts/Boston)

- *Black College Students and Factors Influencing Their Major Field Choice*
  (Dr. Gail E. Thomas, Center for Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University)

- *Institutional Effectiveness in the Production of Black Baccalaureates*
  (Dr, Philip S. Hart, College of Public and Community Service, University of Massachusetts/Boston)

- *Educational and Occupational Aspirations and Early Attainment of Black Males and Females,*
  (Dr. Edgar G. Epps, University of Chicago, and Dr. Kenneth W. Jackson, University of Houston Downtown Campus)

- *Financial Assistance to Black Doctoral Students in Two ADAMS States: A Policy Analysis,*
  (Dr. James N. Upton and Anne S. Pruitt, Ohio State University)

- *The Decline of Teacher Production in Louisiana (1976-83) and Attitudes Toward the Profession,*
  (Dr. Antoine Garibaldi, Xavier University, Louisiana)

- *Gender and Campus Race Differences in Black Student Academic Performance, Racial Attitudes and College Satisfaction,*
  (Dr. Walter Allen, University of Michigan at Ann Arbor)